

APPENDIX N

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION, COMMUNITY COMMENTS, AND RESPONSES

This list contains community participants who participated in at least one of the public meetings and signed in for a mailing list. Few participant names were not included due to missing information.

A.J. Bayone
Adma Rublicom
Alina Galto
Alma Gates
Aima Gates
Andrew Trotter
Anne Renshaw
Barbara Reed
Brian Bklomquist
Bruce Lowrey
Cathy Wiss
Chris Lane
Christine Romano
Dan Hertz
David Erion
David P. Frankel
David Scott
Dolores Newman
Douglas Stalworth
Edward Sherburne
F. Mahvi
Gary Klacik
Gary Mallard
Gillian Florey
Gina Miringliao
Hazel Rebold
J. Waldmann
J. Bernardi
J. Pablo
Jennifer Papa
Kill Diskan
John Howe
John Sunter

Joyce Fernandez
Kate Dell
Kathy Smith
Leslie Harps
Louis Wolf
Lucy Eldridge
M. Von Amringe
Margaret Schauer
Maria Reff
Marilyn Simon
Marvin Tievrky
Mary Buddenhagen
May Jo Shackelford
Michelle Cornweel
Mike Meier
Nicolas Blancher
Phyllis Fernandez
R. Linden
Richard Huriauz
Rick Honig
Rick Servato
Rob Stein
Ella Silva
Rovert Aiello
Robert Collins
Sarah Underwood
Steve Ponid
Steve Robbins
Sue Hemberger
Sylvia Broadman
The Jettons
Tom Quinn
Torrey Androski

Community Comments

The following summarizes comments received from citizens throughout the study.

From: jciw-centernet [mailto:jciw-centernet@erols.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 3:34 PM

To: colleen.smith@dc.gov

Cc: Collins, Robert (OP)

Subject: Friendship Heights traffic study

I was pleased but not surprised at the results of the study presented last night. Those of us who live in the blocks immediately off Wisconsin Avenue have observed for some time the traffic and parking problems you identified. Needless to say, I am glad to have my observations validated. I hope remediation will be implemented sooner rather than later.

I do have several comments:

1. The documented speeds over the limit seem to me very low.
2. In referring to blocks on which motorists speed and which they use as cut-throughs, please emphasize that 42nd Street between Military and Jenifer is subject to both.
3. I saw no reference to Harrison Street, but it is a much used cut through from Reno to Wisconsin in both directions. There are stop signs but the blocks, particularly between 41st and 42nd Streets, are long enough for motorists to build up significant speed.
4. Double parked vehicles, particularly on Wisconsin, and on Jenifer between Wisconsin and 43rd Street constantly disrupt traffic. I am particularly aware of the Jenifer block as that is how I get from my 42nd Street (between Military and Jenifer) residence to Wisconsin Avenue. Going out via Military is not feasible either because of turn restrictions, traffic or limited visibility.
5. Suggestion: Remove street parking (it isn't even metered!) from Jenifer Street during weekdays, create loading zones on both sides - and require commercial
6. vehicles to comply.
7. With regard to a pedestrian crossing midblock between Jenifer and Western on Wisconsin, this might sensibly be tied to a light for cars exiting the Pavilion garage. Without such a light, those exiting cars should be prohibited from making a left turn. Another very dangerous and frequent occurrence in that block is cars making u-turns.
8. Restrict parking at alley entrances. There should be at least one car length of no parking zone on each side of entrance. More often than not, exiting an alley is unnecessarily hazardous because vehicles are parked right up to the edge - and if the vehicle is a van or an SUV, one simply cannot see around or over it.
9. Extend 2 hour residential parking limits to 10:30 pm - especially on Friday and Saturday nights. Not only do visitors fill the spaces, employees of local establishments do as well.
10. I noted this morning that there is a magnificent tree in the middle of the intersection of Military, 41st and Reno. While I support looking into a circle there, I want to be sure that the tree is protected.
11. I would like to know what assumptions, if any, you have made about the impact of significant numbers of new residents along Wisconsin Avenue (developments already moving forward, proposed or anticipated at Wisconsin and Albemarle, Wisconsin and Brandywine, Wisconsin and Davenport, and the WMATA site.) While the WMATA site is the only one located in the study area, residents of all the others will be driving up and down Wisconsin Avenue - as will occupants of new housing proposed on the Maryland side of Western Avenue. All of this promises suffocation, literally and figuratively.

It would be helpful at the next meeting if you came with handouts explaining the process required of citizens to secure various traffic calming measures such as bumps. Without doing any canvassing, I know there are some on my block who would strongly favor such steps - we need to know how to achieve them.

Most importantly, traffic improvements will have little or no effect without continuous consistent enforcement. Your department really must confer with whoever is in charge of enforcement of parking and moving violations.

Thank you for your work on this.

Jane Waldmann

From: Michael Stevenson [mailto:stevensonm@erols.com]

Sent: Sunday, June 01, 2003 7:32 PM

To: colleen.smith@dc.gov

Subject: Traffic circle at Reno & Military

Dear Ms. Smith,

I am writing with a preliminary comment on the idea of a traffic circle, rather than a signal, at the intersection of Military Road, Reno Road, and 41st Street. I live at 4103 Military Road -- that's on the north side of Military, west of 41st, one house in from the northwest corner of Military and 41st. I assume the planners have considered various pros and cons to the notion of a traffic circle there. But I want to raise one problem that I doubt the planners have taken into account.

The problem is that my driveway is right off of the westbound lane of Military Road. There is no street parking on my side (the north side, westbound) of the street, so I regularly park in the driveway. There is no alley entrance or other entrance to my driveway or my backyard. This has two significant consequences:

1. Because of the fairly constant traffic on Military, it would be extremely difficult -- and often virtually impossible -- for me to pull my car out of the driveway and onto Military if it were not for the current traffic signal that pauses the westbound traffic.
2. When I wish to make a left turn into my driveway from the eastbound lane of Military (which I very frequently do), that is usually manageable only because the signal has paused the westbound traffic. Without the signal, I would often have to wait a long time to make that left turn into my driveway, and if that happens all of the other eastbound traffic will back up behind me until I could make the turn. Because my driveway provides the only parking conveniently situated to my house, it provides an important part of my property's value and was in fact a very important consideration when I purchased the house -- as I believe it would be for future potential purchasers. For the reasons described above, if a circle replaces the signal, it will present serious problems for me (and for the traffic that will sometimes be held up waiting for me), and it will substantially impair the value of the driveway and the value of the property.

It may have been easy for planners to overlook this problem since, among the residents of my block, I believe I am the only one whose property would be affected in this particular way. The residents on the south side, and the residents to the west of me on the north side, all have parking at the rear of their property accessible by alleyways and not affected by traffic on Military.

I am not necessarily opposed to replacing the existing signal with a one-lane circle. I would ask, however, that any planning for a circle take into account the problem I've described. I would expect that experienced traffic planners could come up with some small fix that would avoid the problems I've described.

Michael Stevenson
4103 Military Road, NW
Washington, DC 20015

From: Sandra Shapiro [mailto:sandyshap@msn.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2003 2:24 PM
To: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov
Cc: eldridgel@aol.com
Subject:

Dear Ms. Smith,

Thank you for taking my call the other day. As I briefly told you, I am very concerned that the construction of a one-lane circle at the three-way intersection of 41st Street, Reno Road and Military Road would prevent me and others from safely walking to the local park on Livingston Street. As a mother of two young children, visits to the park by foot are frequent. In fact, one of the reasons that we bought our home was because of its proximity to the playground. If I were to take an alternative route to the park (avoiding the intersection), I would be forced to cross over a busy and dangerous intersection at 39th Street and Reno Road and the distance of my trip would be increased substantially.

Contrary to the reported comments made by the consultants that "few pedestrians use the intersection (Northwest Current, May 28)," I would argue that MANY people cross the street there on foot. Off hand, I can think of at least six families, on my block alone, who often walk to the park crossing over Military Road at 41st Street.

While I appreciate the need to alleviate traffic congestion, I do not believe that it should be done at the expense of the pedestrian, particularly since it is a highly trafficked pedestrian route.

Thank you.

Sandy Shapiro
3901 Harrison Street, NW
Washington, DC 20015

From: Huriaux, Richard [mailto:Richard.Huriaux@rspa.dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 02, 2003 10:08 AM
To: 'colleen.smith@dc.gov'
Subject: Friendship Heights Traffic Study

I just became aware that there is a Friendship Heights traffic study being conducted by consultants on behalf of DC-DOT. I am interested in being placed on any mailing lists concerning this study. My special interest is the traffic circle idea for the intersection of 41st / Reno / Military. My triangular

property abuts all three streets. The idea of a traffic circle is interesting, but I am concerned about the potential impacts on trees and on my property. Thanks for your assistance.

Richard D. Huriaux
5318 Reno Road, NW
Washington, DC 20015

From: Bill Montwieler [mailto:wjmontwieler@earthlink.net]

Sent: Monday, June 02, 2003 9:22 AM

To: colleen.smith@dc.gov

Cc: sunderwood@eandggroup.com; NMontwieler@bna.com; mcbuddenhagen@earthlink.net

Subject: Opposition to Small Circle Proposal on Military Road

Dear Ms. Smith, Please add my wife, Nancy, and me to the people who very surprised to learn about a proposal for a small traffic circle on Military and Reno from a hand out from Ms. Underwood. As residents of 3939 Military Road NW (east of the proposed circle) for 25 years, we are appalled that affected parties were not informed by the city that this was under consideration.

We are opposed to the suggestion for the following reasons:

- 1) We walk across the affected area at least four and usually six times a day. How will we cross the circle? Will it be safer for pedestrians? It appears to us that you will be discouraging pedestrian traffic, thus forcing us to find a different route to Metro, and to the stores in that area. Moreover, there are a fair number of children who walk down Reno to Murch Elementary School, or North to the play ground at 41st and Western. We fail to see how a circle would help them.
- 2) How will large busses and trucks and other vehicles get around a "small" circle? Will they be forced onto side streets?
- 3) We are concerned that the addition of a circle and the elimination of traffic lights will have an adverse impact on vehicular traffic as well. You would be better off putting the omniscient traffic cameras on the corners.
- 4) We believe the addition of a traffic light at 39th and Military some years ago has gone a long way towards slowing traffic in the area.
- 5) Sometime ago the lights at Reno and Military used to be turned to "yellow" at night. If that is still the case, you could slow traffic by making that a "stop" light all through the night.

Please keep us informed of any decision or further activity on this terrible proposal.

William J. and Nancy H. Montwieler
3939 Military Road NW
Washington, DC 20015

From: Rfpsa@aol.com [mailto:Rfpsa@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, June 02, 2003 10:34 AM
To: colleen.smith@dc.gov
Subject: Traffic Circle at Military Rd & 41st & Reno

Dear Ms Smith"

I live at the corner of Military and 41st where they intersect Reno Road. I am concerned about a couple of things.

First, the area seems awfully small for a traffic circle. Are you planning to "seize" any of the owned land?

Second, even with traffic lights, there are constant crashes and near crashes. Will the circle have traffic lights to help-- as at Dupont Circle or Massachusetts and Nebraska-- or none-- as at the Western-Connecticut intersection?

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

Randi Finger, PhD
4100 Military Rd. NW
Washington, D.C. 20015

Date: Mon, 2 Jun 2003 20:50:31 -0400 (EDT)
From: chas2112@mindspring.com
To: colleen.smith@dc.gov
Subject: Proposed Traffic Circle at Military and Reno Roads NW
Cc: sunderwood@eandggroup.com

Dear Ms Smith:

It has come to my attention that a =E2=80=9Csmall=E2=80=9D traffic circle is being proposed for the intersection of Reno Road and Military Road in Chevy Chase. I must respectfully state that such an idea could only be conceived in a lunatic asylum.

A traffic circle, any sized traffic circle, will ruin the aesthetic appeal of the neighborhood and increase the danger level for the scores of children and elderly residents who reside in the area. The area is already host to three major streets and certainly does not need catering for yet more automobile traffic. Indeed this echoes the disastrous policies of Robert Moses in 1950s New York City.

Washington DC has always bucked the trends in the rest of the country by providing a livable, pedestrian-friendly city where a car is usually the last option. The future happened here, not in Tyson Corner or Rockville. This city is an example for the rest of the country to follow. The more that such projects are implemented, the further the sense of community deteriorates. And what are we left with then? Nothing more than a bunch of strangers separated by a sea of parking lots.

Furthermore, even the smallest of traffic circles will inevitably encroach on several homes. I doubt the city has the resources to devote to the inevitable lawsuits that will emerge. Spend the money on something else. Plant some trees, repair a playground, anything else. This simply makes no sense whatsoever. Spending nearly my entire life in this area has given me the right to say that. Please consider the consequences and the negative impact not only on our lives, but the City life as well.

Thank you for your time.

Very truly yours,

Charles F. Buddenhagen
5316 Reno Road NW
Washington, DC 20015

From: Mary Jacoby [<mailto:maryjacoby@starpower.net>]
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 10:27 AM
To: colleen.smith@dc.gov
Subject: 42nd and Military NW
Ms. Smith -

Please be aware that the intersection of Military Rd and 42nd St. NW is extremely dangerous. I regularly see spectacular car crashes there - cars totaled, airbags deployed, even a utility pole was once downed. Even more frightening is the heavy pedestrian traffic at that corner, including mothers pushing strollers, as people head to the Metro and Friendship Heights shopping.

Faster speeds on Military between Wisconsin and Connecticut will endanger lives. In fact, that intersection needs a four-way stop sign, but I fear your goal is to make it more convenient for commuters and more dangerous for pedestrians and others who live and pay taxes in the neighborhood.

Please take some time to stroll personally through that intersection sometime, and watch the cars illegally make left turns or go straight. Watch the near misses, view the shattered glass that's always on the ground. I'm sure you can access the accident information from DC police. I hope you are taking this into account in your traffic study.

Sincerely,

Mary Jacoby
4115 Military Rd. NW

From: brian blomquist [<mailto:pablomquist@starpower.net>]
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2003 1:56 PM
To: colleen.smith
Subject: traffic study

Dear Ms. Smith,

Thank you for your time.

I feel DC should fight fire with fire and implement the same traffic plan as Chevy Chase, Maryland. They have completely blocked all through traffic into residential neighborhoods from East-Wesy Highway to Western Avenue. The same is true for River Road, no access to Wisconsin Avenue.

If Maryland can take away access to residential neighborhoods, why can't D.C.?

Why can't Maryland share the burden of traffic to the Friendship Heights area (that they built up!) and re-open the roads!!!

Trish Blomquist
Ingomar St, NW

From: D Diggs [<mailto:teddave95@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2003 8:37 PM
To: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov; Mbird@louisberger.com
Subject: Military Road

Dear Ms. Smith and Ms. Bird,

I am a Chevy Chase DC neighbor--have lived here a number of years as a child, again as a young adult and now as a mother of a three year old. I have a few points I would like to raise for your consideration.

1. Contrary to what was cited in the NW Current by the contractors, there certainly seem to be many pedestrians who use the intersection of Reno and Military and (what I believe is) 41st Street. Many Metro commuters use that route to go to the metro and many of us who are around the neighborhood use that route to walk to errands, visit the playground or friends and family. I, therefore, think that traffic lights, keeping a pattern that allows pedestrians to cross the streets safely, is a better choice than a roundabout.
2. At the corner of Chevy Chase Parkway and Military Road, a driver approaching Military along Ch Pkwy from the south has a dangerously limited view of the oncoming (especially the eastbound) traffic on Military Road. This is mostly because parking spots are allowed so close to that corner on the eastbound side of Military that the vision of the northbound driver is obstructed.
3. Anything that could be done to tone down the speed or the risks that drivers take as they come southbound on Connecticut and whip around the corner, turning left onto Military to head east would be appreciated. My daughter (in a stroller) and I were nearly hit there a few months back. Though I am experienced as a city pedestrian, I approach that intersection with trepidation because of the speed with which drivers take that corner--they often seem to be trying to beat the green light for the northbound Connecticut Avenue traffic.

Please feel free to contact me if it seems helpful.

Thank you both for your time and efforts.

From: Mike Meier [mailto:mikemeier@internationallawgroup.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2003 3:32 PM
To: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov
Cc: mbird@louisberger.com
Subject: Friendship Heights Traffic Study - Neglect of 43rd St between Military & Jenifer

12 June 2003
D.C. Department of Transportation
ATTN. Ms. Colleen Smith
2000 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009
CC: Ms. Melissa Bird

RE: Friendship Heights Traffic Study

Dear Ms. Smith:

I am the President of the Courts of Chevy Chase, a 29-unit town home development on the 5300 block of 43rd Street, N.W. (Between Military Road and Jenifer Street). Also, together with Ms. Jill Diskan, I attended the first public meeting on the Friendship Heights traffic study. In fact, we were the only two people in the audience.

I have reviewed a copy of the preliminary findings of the Friendship Heights traffic study, and am concerned about the neglect of 43rd Street between Military Road and Jenifer Street.

Our residential street is the preferred cut-through for commuters going in either direction who wish to connect between Military Road and Wisconsin Avenue. The reasons are, for example, that one cannot turn left onto Wisconsin Avenue coming from Military Road (East).

Your investigations so far should have clearly revealed that to you. In addition, as you may have noticed, there is a child care center on our street, and we have many families with children.

This cut-through traffic, often going at very high speed, is a grave danger and it is only a matter of time until someone (probably a child) will be injured or killed.

We have previously alerted you to that very dangerous situation, and residents (including myself) have notified the Department of Transportation. Therefore, I would greatly appreciate if you took a look at this situation and included it in this study. I would also appreciate if you informed me of your findings.

Thank you very much!

Very truly yours,
Mike Meier

Mike Meier
International Law Group, PLLC
2829 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite103
Washington DC 20008 - USA

From: P. Butturini & G. Mirigliano [<mailto:pgb@tidalwave.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2003 10:53 AM
To: Smith, Colleen
Subject: RE: [CSTO-DC] Friendship Heights Transportation Study -- MeetingJune 25th at 7:00 p.m.

Hi Colleen.

The meeting I refer to is the 3/13/03 meeting. There was not a Powerpoint Presentation made. Poster boards were placed on easels showing the study area. The consultants explained their objectives and asked for input, both verbal and written. It was during this meeting that I raised the concerns, orally and in writing, related to Garrison Street, N.W.

How can these concerns get incorporated?

Thanks.

Peter Butturini
Gina Mirigliano
pgb@tidalwave.net

From: Smithhemb@aol.com [<mailto:Smithhemb@aol.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2003 9:44 PM
To: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov
Subject: Friendship Height Traffic study -- parking problems

Dear Ms. Smith --

I'm not sure whether you're aware of this, but the parking problems on 43rd St. and on 42nd St. have different causes. 43rd Street is primarily shoppers who could/should be encouraged to park in the underutilized garages associated with the complexes they are shopping in. The best way to do that, as I'm sure you heard at tonight's meeting, would be to have the malls offer 2 hour free parking so that they give the same deal financially as the street does.

42nd Street, which is where I live, gets fewer shoppers. Most of the people parking on my street are Ward 3 residents headed to the Metro Station for their weekday commutes. I don't think that these people could or should be steered into the commercial garages. They'd probably choose to drive rather than take the subway if that were the tradeoff and there's no good reason/obligation of the mall/garage owners to subsidize their parking.

Personally, I don't think that the parking situation on 42nd Street is problematic at this point. Yes, non-residents park here all day, but there are so few residents on that strip of 42nd (where there are houses on only one side of the street -- Lisner Home which has/uses its own lot is on the other). The problem 42nd Street may soon encounter is if the Stonebridge condominiums decide to sell their garage parking spaces separately from the units and a significant number of residents choose to use the street rather than pay for the garage. To me, it makes more sense to demand that Stonebridge provide parking for their residents as part of the condo sales price (and they are building under a PUD, so presumably that's possible) than to make it difficult for Metro commuters to park on 42nd St. (Because, once again, as in the shopping malls/43rd St. scenario, you have a developer bringing lots of people/cars into the neighborhood and not shouldering the responsibility of providing parking. It's greed pure and simple that leaves those garages empty and leaves everyone fighting for parking on the street.)

Sue Hemberger
5415 42nd St., NW
Friendship Heights

From: jciw-centernet [mailto:jciw-centernet@erols.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2003 2:38 PM
To: colleen.smith@dc.gov
Subject: traffic study

Thank you for your even disposition at last night's sometimes contentious meeting. You share with Robert Collins an ability to maintain a calm demeanor which is a real asset.

I do have some comments and concerns. First, though perhaps notification for meetings can be improved (since I was on the list, I received a post card), there are already several ways citizens could have learned about the study itself, and the meetings; Kathy Smith's email newsletter, the ANC meeting, the NW Current, word of mouth, and possibly others. For someone to expect a mailed notice is, in my view, unreasonable. Those whose time is too valuable to concern themselves with any but those issues literally in their own front yards don't get a lot of sympathy from me. That said, an excellent place to post meeting notices is in public libraries - and the playground is also a reasonable place. Even if you mailed notices or delivered flyers to peoples' homes, many wouldn't even look at them - and they would still complain!

I've read the material on the roundabout. It is unclear to me whether in the study reported the roundabouts were subject to heavy commuter traffic on arterial roads lined with residences. That, I think, may make Military Road a somewhat different situation. And if I faced the taking of part of my property to make this happen - thereby also bringing traffic and pollution nearer to my house - I would have very serious misgivings.

I also think the psychology of drivers here may be significantly different from that of the areas studied. People here feel very important and very time-deprived. The combination results in unbelievable driving behavior (U turn from right lane - right in front of the car in the left lane - on Wisconsin Ave southbound between Ingomar and Harrison at mid-day!) Red light running is still a huge problem. Right turn on red should be eliminated at major intersections - the pedestrian hasn't a chance. And, as with so many things, there is little maintenance or enforcement. Even if there had been a policeman witnessing that U-turn, I'd be speechless with surprise if he/she took any action. One gets the impression they can't be bothered.

I agree that improved signage, road markings, could make a huge improvement in traffic flow. And an active police presence especially at busy times of day would help. These are things which might be implemented inexpensively - and quickly.

I would like to suggest that stop signs be added to Jenifer St. at 42nd St. making that a 4 way stop intersection. Cars traveling on Jenifer, particularly westbound, travel quite fast, the visibility from 42nd Street is very poor and the intersection is a problem. Also, stop signs at every intersection also help to discourage cut through traffic.

While I recognize that 43rd St from Jenifer to Military is a problem, I am strongly opposed to reorienting the diverter. As it is, if I want to go north on Wisconsin, my efficient safe alternative is to go down the alley nearest Military from 42nd St. to 43rd St., left on 43rd to Jenifer and then to Wisconsin. There is no left turn onto Military from 42nd St., and although lefts are permitted from 42nd Place and 43rd St., they are unsafe except possibly very early on weekend mornings, due to traffic and/or poor sight lines. The alley from 42nd to 43rd nearest Jenifer is one way from 42nd Place to 43rd and therefore off limits. As I said at the meeting, I would prefer to see rush hour restrictions on turns onto Jenifer from Wisconsin, leaving Jenifer westbound open so day care parents can get out to Wisconsin.

No matter what is done, there will be more than a few people who think the rules don't apply to them. So I reemphasize the need for enforcement. Some statement from the police as to how they will do their part to implement traffic calming/improvement measures would be useful.

With regard to the parking restrictions, don't you mean on page 17, #3 "restrict...for those **without** a zone 3 permit. Those of us holding permits are not restricted - it's those without. And yes, a 1 hour restriction would help, as would extending the time of the restriction to 10:30 pm on Friday and Saturday nights. I think it is currently 8:30 which is fine for weekdays. Again, rigorous enforcement is needed.

Lastly, assuming that improved main arterials will discourage cut-throughs is somewhat optimistic. Many people want to keep moving - and it is easier to slide through a stop sign than stop at a light. Rush hour turn restrictions, even if not 100% observed, would help, as would banning through trucks over a certain weight on residential streets.

Thanks for your hard work.

Jane Waldmann

From: Frankel, David [<mailto:DFRANKEL@ftc.gov>]

Sent: Friday, June 27, 2003 12:44 PM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT)

Cc: pgb@tidalwave.net; Lucy Eldridge; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; Amy Hoang; Abauer4600@aol.com; Matt Helfant; Polly King

Subject: Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Dear Colleen:

It was a pleasure meeting with you and the Louis Berger Group, Inc. consultants on Wednesday evening to learn about and to provide comments on the ongoing Friendship Heights Transportation Study (the

"Study"). I would like to take this opportunity to put in writing some of the comments I have. I request that you take them into account and address them as you continue your work on this Study.

1. As resident Gina Mirigliano stated so well during the meeting, it is clear that the greatest emphasis of the Study to date has been on the northern and eastern portions of the Study area. The area west of Wisconsin Avenue seems to have been given less emphasis. This needs to be rectified.

2. I have lived on the 4300 block of Garrison Street, N.W. (i.e., just to the west of Wisconsin Avenue) for almost 17 years. Because of this, I believe I have an excellent understanding of the situation in this area and how it has evolved over that time.

3.(a) The most serious problem on my block is the truck traffic that uses the western portion of Garrison Street, N.W. to make deliveries to Rodman's Drug Store. These deliveries occur from early morning (e.g., 6:00 a.m.) and continue throughout the day. There are two green and white signs stating that trucks are required to use Wisconsin Avenue to move to and from Rodman's loading dock area, but these signs are ignored. One of these signs is located directly across from the Rodman's loading dock area and the other is on the corner of Wisconsin and Garrison. It is not clear to me that these signs have any legal significance and whether the police are even permitted to ticket trucks that use the residential portion of Garrison Street to make deliveries. Neighborhood residents have discussed this situation with Rodman's officials and the police, and ANC 3E has even negotiated a written agreement with Rodman's about it, but the problem persists. Admittedly, it has improved a little bit over the past five years, but it remains a problem.

(b) The through truck traffic on Garrison Street -- especially by "18 wheelers" -- has destroyed many curbside trees along the street. For example, the large trees in front of my house and my neighbor's house at 4328 Garrison Street have both had their branches on the street side destroyed by large trucks until they finally had to be removed entirely by the city.

(c) The through truck traffic on Garrison Street also causes cracks in plaster walls as they shift through their gears on the short blocks. I constantly have to pay to repair cracks in my attic office plaster walls and ceilings and our house inspector has stated that this may be caused by truck traffic.

(d) The through truck traffic on Garrison Street is noisy, especially early in the mornings, when we are trying to sleep, and it causes unwanted air pollution.

4. The second most serious problem on my block is the illegal use of the alley that runs between 4300 blocks of Garrison and Harrison Streets, N.W. -- the alley that is to the east of and which parallels 44th Street. That alley is clearly marked on the Harrison Street side with "Do Not Enter" and "One Way" signs showing that it is illegal to drive south from Harrison Street to Garrison Street. Yet, many, many cars and trucks make this illegal trip each day. There is no enforcement and it adds greatly to the traffic on Garrison Street, N.W. You must work to stop this.

5. Motor vehicles of all types speed along Garrison Street well above the speed limit. Most cars pay little attention to the stop sign at the corner of Garrison Street and 44th Street, N.W. Again, there is no enforcement and this creates a dangerous situation, especially for the many children who live in the area.

6. I would like to see more ways for pedestrians to cross Wisconsin Avenue throughout the Study area and not just near the Jennifer Street intersection.

7. I am an avid bicyclist and I saw nothing in the Study to encourage bicycling. I request that you contact the Washington Area Bicyclist Association and the DC Bicycle Coordinator and request their input into

the Study. They may be able to suggest ways to encourage more trips via bicycle and fewer by car. Perhaps it is as simple as placing attractive bike racks along Wisconsin Avenue. Also, any new developments should be required to provide secure bicycle parking and showers for bike commuters as is already required in the DC zoning ordinances.

8. It is imperative that your Study take into account not only the traffic situation as it exists today, but also the traffic as it will exist in two to five years, and also in the surrounding area. So, for example, the Study must take into account the proposed high density developments that are proposed for the old Sear's/Heckinger's site, the Martens Volvo site, the Babe's Billiards site, the WMATA bus terminal site, the development at the corner of Western Avenue and Military Road and the entire Montgomery County Friendship Heights development. These various developments will certainly bring thousands of additional motor vehicle trips to our neighborhoods each day. We have got to keep these motor vehicles off the residential streets and onto the main arterials. These arterials are: Wisconsin Avenue, Western Avenue, River Road, Military Road, Reno Road, Connecticut Avenue, Nebraska Avenue and Massachusetts Avenue. Anything short of this will be a failure.

9. I am concerned that any success you have might be short-lived for the following reason. Let's assume that you succeed in getting traffic moving onto arterial roads and off the residential streets and that arterial flow is increased. Might that success simply cause people who might otherwise be taking other routes, like Connecticut Avenue, to switch over to Wisconsin Avenue? Let me explain what I mean. Right now, when I need to travel to North Bethesda or Rockville, I do NOT take Wisconsin Avenue even though it is the shortest route to my destination. This is because Wisconsin Avenue is backed up in Tenleytown, Friendship Heights, Chevy Chase and Bethesda. So, to get to my destination, I either take River Road or cross over to Connecticut Avenue and then head north. If Wisconsin Avenue were to become more motor vehicle friendly, I and many others would simply use it more frequently and thereby reduce the effectiveness of your efforts.

I appreciate your efforts and wish you success. I request that my views be taken into consideration and addressed as you continue this Study. Also, please share these comments with the consultants.

Sincerely,

David P. Frankel
4336 Garrison Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016-4035

From: Sstunderwood@aol.com [mailto:Sstunderwood@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, June 27, 2003 4:51 PM
To: colleen.smith@dc.gov
Subject: Friendship Heights Traffic Study

Colleen,

I'd like to thank you for the very informative presentation on Wednesday evening. I thought the whole team conducted itself with great restraint in the face of unwarranted criticism. I'm sorry you were subjected to that.

I did not have a chance to speak before I had to leave. I live at 4104 Military Road and wanted to express

my views on the alternatives for the Military/Reno Road intersection. First, I would strongly urge that we start with the less aggressive option, rather than the roundabout and see if that, combined with the other proposed surrounding improvements, produces enough improvement. I think that option, including the actuated signals and the red light camera, would be less disruptive to those of us who live immediately adjacent to the intersection. I am also concerned about the cost of the roundabout. Second, I am not very happy about the loss of parking in front of my house, which appears inevitable whatever else happens at the intersection. I am lucky in that I have 2 off-street spaces behind my house, but some of my neighbors have none. I do fairly often make use of the street space for visitors. Eliminating the street spaces in front of the first 5 or 6 houses west of 41st will impact on all of us in the block, whether or not we have off street spaces. Could you think about whether it would be possible to eliminate the street parking only at rush hour and allow it at other times? Finally, I thought the other recommendations sounded generally workable and that you have correctly identified the worst bottlenecks in the area. I would, however, defer to those who live closer to the other trouble spots who have specific concerns and suggestions. I do think its very important to deal with the double parking in northbound Wisconsin Avenue, especially at Maggiano's.

Lastly, two questions:

1. Can you tell me the daily traffic volume passing through the Military/Reno intersection in all directions?
2. Has the team thought about what, if any, effect the reopening of Klinge Road will have on Military Road? It seems to me logical that if there are so few routes that cross the Park, reopening one that had been closed would reduce traffic on all the others.

Again, thank you for the consideration you are giving to all of our often unreconcilable views.

Sarah Underwood

From: Marilyn Simon [mailto:Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2003 2:44 PM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT); Kim, Ji Youn

Cc: mjsimon524@aol.com; Lucy.Eldridge@verizon.net; Chapman Todd; abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com

Subject: Friendship Heights Transportation Study: Comments

I attended the Public Meeting on the Friendship Heights Transportation Study on June 25, 2003 at the Armenian Church. In that presentation, the Berger Group first presented to the community a proposal to change the traffic diverter at 43rd and Jenifer Streets, by removing the diverter and replacing it with a diverter "so as to be perpendicular to the existing layout." I strenuously oppose this proposal,

I have owned my house on the 5200 block of 43rd Street, NW, since 1985, and the following comments are based on driving and observing traffic in this neighborhood for that period, as well as from driving to Friendship Heights to shop and go to the movies when I lived on the 5500 block of 30th Street, NW and in Cleveland Park. I believe that changing the diverter, as proposed, will worsen traffic conditions on the neighboring residential streets, including the 5300 block of 43rd Street. I feel that the study giving rise to this proposal was flawed in many significant respects.

The following comments review the proposal and the June 25 presentation. Following my review of the analysis presented, I provide some other suggestions to address some of the neighborhood traffic and parking concerns.

1. The proposal is only focused on one issue: north(east)-bound, cut-through traffic on the 5300 block of 43rd Street. It did not consider the cut-through traffic headed in other directions or the north-bound cut-through traffic on other blocks. The analysis also did not seem to evaluate the effect of the proposal on other blocks or other traffic that might use the 5300 block of 43rd Street with the new configuration.
2. In addressing this issue, traffic counts were taken on the 5300 block of 43rd Street, but traffic counts were not taken on other residential streets that carry significant cut-through traffic and traffic seeking free parking, to determine whether the 5300 block of 43rd Street is unique. Efforts to reduce traffic on that block would likely divert it to others. Such actions should not be taken unless [non-summer] traffic counts on other residential streets are taken, to determine whether that block is unique in the traffic it carries. Based on my observations, I believe that many other residential blocks carry significant excess traffic. It would be most appropriate to take those counts during the fall or winter shopping seasons.
3. The study did not take into account the through-block connector between Military Road and Jenifer Street in Square 1661. The purpose of the through-block connector is to take south-bound traffic off the 5300 block of 43rd Street. Better signage for the through-block connector should be implemented, if this is to take additional traffic off the 5300 block of 43rd Street. By allowing southbound traffic on the 5300 block of 43rd Street to turn eastbound on Jenifer Street, we might see that the 5300 block of 43rd Street becomes a more attractive option for many drivers who would otherwise use the through-block connector.
4. The study does not consider the use of alleys for cut-through traffic. Cut-through traffic in alleys was an issue raised with the ANC. Yet the alleys and the through-block connector were not shown on the pattern of streets that the consultants were reviewing to determine likely effects. Reorientation of the diverter will encourage cut-through traffic in the alley behind the 5200 block of 43rd Street, which already experiences cut-through traffic to avoid congestion on the 5200 block of 43rd Street. The 5200 block of 43rd Street serves as an unofficial Kiss and Ride for the Jenifer Street Metro entrance. It is also used as an additional loading zone for 5225 Wisconsin Avenue, since the required loading dock on the 4300 block of Jenifer does not seem to offer access to the office building. In addition, parents dropping children off at the Chevy Chase Plaza Children's Center will park in the traffic lane on the 5200 block of 43rd Street while they escort their children to the CCPCC at 5310 43rd Street.
5. North-bound traffic, in an effort to avoid upper Wisconsin Avenue, uses several other cut throughs, such as Fessenden, Harrison and Ingomar to 42nd Street, or going directly from Wisconsin to 42nd Street. 41st Street also carries cut-through traffic, especially given that the congestion is not limited to the 5300 block of Wisconsin Avenue.
6. South-bound and east-bound cut-through traffic was not considered in this proposal.
7. Significant new traffic will be generated by construction in Friendship Heights, Maryland, and Military and Reno Roads are currently favored routes from Chevy Chase and Bethesda to downtown or the Rock Creek Parkway at Massachusetts Avenue. The proposed reorientation of the traffic diverter will encourage south-bound cut-through traffic on the 5300 block of 43rd Street and the 4100 and 4200 blocks of Jenifer Street, in order to avoid congestion on Military at the intersection of Military, 41st and Reno Roads. There would be only two stop signs between Military and Reno in that cut-through route.
8. The proposed reorientation of the diverter will also encourage the use of Jenifer Street as a cut-through route to get from Western and Wisconsin to Connecticut Avenue, as it was before the diverter was put in in the 1970s.
9. At the meeting, in response to my raising the issue of the use of the 5300 block of 43rd Street and Jenifer Streets as a cut-through to Reno Road, I was told that people wouldn't use that as a cut-through,

since they will solve the congestion issues at Military and Reno and 41st Streets, and that the cut through will add 5-10 seconds to the route, which drivers will not tolerate. Given all the new traffic that will be generated, I am less certain that congestion on Military Road can be eliminated entirely, and I know that most drivers, myself included, will cut through neighborhood streets, even if it takes slightly longer, to avoid the irritation involved in queuing at a congested intersection. Since there are only two stop signs on Jenifer, at Reno and at 41st Streets, I also think it unlikely that it would even take additional time.

10. Another impact of the proposed change on the neighborhood is that traffic flowing from the new Friendship Boulevard, between the Hecht's and Geico sites, would continue along Jenifer Street, as it does now, but, instead of turning right to go southbound on Wisconsin, the traffic will be continue across Wisconsin to the 4300 block of Jenifer Street and the 5200 block of 43rd Street, into the residential neighborhood, to either cut through to Reno Road, or to seek free on-street parking.

11. As shown in the diagram distributed at the June 25 meeting, the proposal will also involve the elimination of the island at the southern exit to the garage on Square 1661. That island was placed there so that vehicles exiting the garage would not be able to take a left turn, and drive on the 5300 block of 43rd Street. Instead, they would be required to turn right and use Jenifer Street to Wisconsin or through to Friendship Boulevard. In addition, since the through-block connector is one-way southbound, traffic is unlikely to turn left with the current configuration of the diverter, to go back to Military Road. The proposal, along with the elimination of the island, will result in traffic from the garage being allowed to take a left on Jenifer to the 5200 block of 43rd Street, and into the neighborhood streets to take a short cut to Reno or Connecticut. In addition, trucks using the through-block connector to serve the commercial tenants on square 1661 will be able to turn left and use the 5200 block of 43rd Street and vehicles using the through block connector, can use the 5200 block of 43rd Street to work their way through the neighborhood or to find free on-street parking.

12. A resident of the 5300 block of 43rd Street had, in the past, proposed traffic changes on that block to cut traffic, such as the recent proposal to make that block one-way southbound. At each instance, the neighborhood stated that this could not be dealt with on a block-by-block basis, since the traffic would be diverted to the neighboring streets, which also face a significant amount of cut-through traffic and traffic searching for free parking. Members of the community hoped that the Friendship Heights Transportation Study would fully consider traffic throughout the area and only propose solutions that would not negatively impact other streets, and even alleys, that already carry significant traffic. In the proposal and the presentation, it become clear that, at least with respect to the proposal to change the traffic diverter, the effect on other streets was not being considered and sources of traffic were not being considered.

13. In advance of the study, the neighbors brought many issues to the attention of the ANC, which included other cut through traffic and excess traffic on the residential streets related to seeking parking for Metro and shopping.

14. The proposal also recommends that the diverter be reconstructed to eliminate vehicles mounting the curb. The neighborhood had made that request in the past and was told that the diverter could not be altered that way, since it is necessary that emergency vehicles have the ability to mount the curb.

15. The third recommendation in the June 25 handout is unclear. It states: "Restrict parking to one-hour from two-hours with "Zone 3 Permit" (also on 42nd Pl. and 42nd St.)." First, it is unclear whether they are proposing that the time limit apply also to holders of Zone 3 permits, who now have a 72 hour limit, and second, it is unclear which blocks they are referring to. Is it just the 5300 blocks of 42nd and 43rd Streets, or are they proposing a similar limit for the neighboring blocks which have similar parking problems? If the limit is to apply also to Zone 3 holders, then residents of those blocks will need to park on neighboring blocks. If the limit is to apply just to non-zone 3 holders, but is limited to the 5300 blocks

of those streets, it will force much of the shopping and Metro parking to the neighboring blocks, which already are overwhelmed.

In summary, the likely impact of proposed change in the traffic diverter has not been fully analyzed, and I believe that such a change would have a serious negative impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood.

I have several other suggestions that might be considered for dealing with traffic on the 5300 block of 43rd Street and the other neighborhood streets.

1. The north-bound traffic on the 5300 block of 43rd Street, as well as the other streets that carry significant cut-through traffic, can be cut significantly, without changing the current traffic diverter if the congestion issue on the 5300 block of Wisconsin Avenue were addressed. Much congestion on Wisconsin Avenue is caused by the existence of meters on Wisconsin Avenue, double parking for deliveries and for armored car trucks, and by the queuing in front of Maggiano's. Whenever a car chooses to parallel park, Wisconsin Avenue-northbound narrows to one lane. This is exacerbated by the fact that drivers spotting a potential metered space will wait for the driver to load the car, get in and exit, blocking a lane of Wisconsin Avenue for a significant period of time. Elimination of those meters, and requiring that the businesses offer at least two hours of free validated parking, as they did until the mid 1980's, would directly address much of the congestion issue and would eliminate at least some incentive to use the 5300 block of 43rd Street, as well as the other streets that are currently being used to avoid traffic on Wisconsin Avenue.

2. Requiring two hours of free validated parking [3 hours for movies and restaurants] would also cut, but not eliminate the use of neighborhood streets as a mall parking lot. While many shoppers and moviegoers used the neighborhood streets when there was free validated parking, the situation became significantly worse when the validated parking was eliminated.

3. DDOT and DPW should review the transportation agreements associated with the three PUDs on Square 1661 and with Mazza Gallerie to determine whether the developers and current owners have complied with all the terms of the PUD, and in particular to determine whether there were conditions on providing free validated parking, and DDOT and DPW should determine whether the required payments for traffic studies and/or payments for road improvements had been made. The required payments and improvements were estimated to be worth at least \$500,000 for the Abrams PUD alone.

4. I propose the following practical solution to the parking issues and associated traffic on the blocks that currently serve as a free parking lot for the commercial district, while the underground lots are underutilized:

Set up a sub-zone, say, Zone 3A, and require that a Zone 3A sticker be displayed to allow parking for more than four hours, and that a Zone 3 sticker would allow parking for more than one hour, but not more than four hours.

Zone 3A might be defined as the same area as covered by the transportation study [the area in the District north of Fessenden, between 41st and 45th Streets, but excluding the new developments on the Washington Clinic and WMATA sites, which should be required to provide sufficient on-site parking and have that parking utilized by their tenants].

Marilyn Simon
5241 43rd Street NW
Washington, DC 20015

From: Mary Jo Shackelford [mailto:mjshacks.ex@verizon.net]

Sent: Monday, July 21, 2003 12:04 PM

To: Kim, Ji Youn

Cc: kpatterson@dccouncil.us; abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3eo2@aol.com; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; lucy.eldridge@verizon.net

Subject: Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Importance: High

After reviewing the recommendation, both short and long term, for traffic changes in the Friendship Heights area, I am appalled that no consideration has been given to making 43rd Street (between Military and Jenifer) one way.

As a resident of 43rd Street, let me take a few minutes to point out several items of concern for our neighborhood.....

- 1.) With cars parking on both sides of 43rd Street, there is not enough room for two way traffic to safely navigate this street. Parked cars frequently are hit by passing traffic (Side view mirrors are at great risk. Several times open car doors have been hit as the driver is exiting the vehicle).
- 2.) Even with the limited amount of room for two cars to pass, traffic still speeds over the speed limit increasing the possibility of parked cars getting hit.
- 3.) When a large truck or bus travels down 43rd Street, oncoming traffic is stopped as there is no room for a car to safely pass a vehicle of this size.
- 4.) Cars regularly turn around in drive ways, or worse, in the middle of the street, blocking traffic, in an effort to either secure a parking space or exit 43rd street from the opposite direction. These high speed turn arounds to secure a parking place endanger both the children playing in the driveway as well as pedestrians walking along the sidewalks.
- 5.) Due to the high volume of traffic on this street, we often see arguments, disagreements and even, at times, physical encounters over parking spaces and traffic congestion.
- 6.) Weekends are especially bad with increased traffic due to shopping, movies and restaurants. Traffic will get backed up half way down this section of 43rd street, resulting in several cases of "road rage".
- 7.) In an effort to secure parking, often a car will park in front of the fire hydrant, effectively blocking access. This is a grave concern for those of us in the neighborhood. What if we had a fire?

The proposed change to the traffic diverter is a start and certainly will address the bus and truck issue. However, the only way to resolve the other issues to also make 43rd Street (between Military and Jenifer) one way.

I don't know how the study was conducted, but your group only needs to spend a few hours on 43rd Street on Saturday afternoon, or any evening of the week to observe first hand the issues that the residents live with daily.

Your consideration of this addition to the study and eventual plan implementation is greatly appreciated.

Mary Jo Shackelford
5312 43rd Street, NW
Washington, DC 20015

From: Hazel F. Rebold [<mailto:hfrebold@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2003 2:07 PM
To: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov; Kim, Ji Youn; Kathy Patterson; abauer4600@aol.com;
amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; lucy.eldridge@verison.net
Subject: Friendship Heights Traffic Study

I wish to register objection to the proposal in the Friendship Heights Traffic Study to rotate by 90 degrees the existing traffic diverter at 43rd and Jenifer Streets.

For the vast majority of the neighborhood, there is no advantage to such a change. It would do nothing but aggravate all of the residents who have relied on the current traffic patterns for years.

I fully agree that this is an area plagued with traffic and parking problems; please do not make it even WORSE.

Hazel F. Rebold
4228 Military Rd. NW
(corner of Military Rd. and 43rd St.)

From: gflory@starpower.net [<mailto:gflory@starpower.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2003 10:10 AM
To: Kim, Ji Youn
Subject: Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Dear Ms. Kim,

I am a resident of the 5300 block of 43rd Street NW (between Jenifer and Military). I recently learned that my immediate neighborhood is under consideration by the Friendship Heights Transportation Study. In particular, I would like to express my strong support for the proposed modification of the diverter at Jenifer and 43rd Streets NW.

As it is presently configured, the diverter amplifies numerous neighborhood problems by --forcing all cars trolling for free parking onto the 5300 block of 43rd St., which has a much higher density of residential parking than neighboring streets, especially the 4200 block of 43rd St., due to the townhouses on the western side of the street; --creating a high-speed cut-through for drivers wishing to avoid the congested block of Wisconsin between Jenifer and Western and the intersection of Western and Wisconsin; and --encouraging trucks making deliveries to Chadwicks and other Jenifer St. businesses to travel on residential streets.

Modifying the diverter as proposed would significantly ameliorate these problems by eliminating the ability of drivers to use our block as a cut-through; shifting prospective parkers and trucks to a less densely, more commercial populated block of 43rd St.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you maintain a list of interested neighbors, please add my name.

Thanks,
Gillian Flory

5327 43rd St. NW
WDC 20015

From: TROINC@aol.com [mailto:TROINC@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2003 11:52 AM
To: colleen.smith@dc.gov; Kim, Ji Youn
Cc: dickreed@compuserve.com; MJSimon524@aol.com
Subject: Friendship Heights Traffic Study
Good morning,

I have recently been made aware of a proposal to alter the traffic diverter at the intersection of 43rd and Jenifer Streets, NW. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed change.

As a long-time resident and property owner in the area (Jenifer @ 42nd Pl.), I have seen a substantial increase in non-resident traffic. My concern with the proposed change is that the revised traffic pattern would serve to increase traffic in the neighborhood, rather than manage or reduce it. Specifically, as eastbound traffic backs up on Military, especially in the evenings, opening an alternative pathway to Reno/Connecticut via 43rd would create a substantial increase in local traffic. We have already noted many cases of cars (and trucks) who turn off Military Road and use the alleys (via 43rd) and 42nd Pl & St to avoid the lengthy backup @ Reno. Additionally, the substantial Military Road traffic (in both directions) will significantly inhibit flow from 43rd turning left onto Military, which would obviously increase congestion there rather, than reduce it.

I'm sympathetic to the plight of 43rd St residents. I applaud efforts to improve traffic issues in the area -- it is problematic now and will only get worse as major construction begins in the area on both sides of Western. Any traffic planning should obviously include existing, proposed and potential projects on both the DC and MD sides. I take note of DC Strategic Plans that have noted that there is substantial social value in preserving the residential character of the neighborhoods east of Wisconsin Avenue. In the short term, better signage management and increased enforcement seem warranted.

Thank you for your consideration of this position.

Sincerely,

Donald R. Levy

From: Rob Stein [mailto:steinr@washpost.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2003 10:50 AM
To: Kim, Ji Youn; colleen.smith@dc.gov; kpatterson@dccouncil.us; abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; lucy.eldridge@verizon.net
Cc: esilva@npr.org; dickreed@compuserve.com
Subject: 43rd St. traffic diverter

To: Louis Berger Group, Inc.

From: Rob Stein & Ellen Silva
4107 Ingomar St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20015

Re: proposed change to 43rd St. traffic diverter

My wife and I just learned about the proposal to alter the traffic diverter at 43rd and Jenifer Streets so that southbound traffic on 43rd St. would go east on Jenifer instead of west to Wisconsin.

We are extremely upset about this proposal, which we think would have serious, negative effects on our neighborhood. Diverting traffic down Jenifer Street would significantly increase the amount of traffic on the local roads in our neighborhood. Traffic has already increased significantly in the neighborhood. Cars now regularly pass down our block and surrounding residential blocks at high speeds, endangering children, pets and significantly deteriorating the quality of life for residents. This would just make it much worse.

We believe this proposal is the exact opposite of what should be done. Instead, we'd like to see changes made to the traffic patterns in the neighborhood to reduce the amount of traffic. We'd like to see measures similar to those instituted just across the border in Maryland, where it's impossible to access Wisconsin Avenue from the local streets. That prevents cars from using the local roads as a shortcut, in effect creating a protective buffer around the neighborhood. We would very much like to see changes like that made instead.

But at the very least, the proposal to alter the 43rd & Jenifer Sts. traffic diverter should be scrapped.

From: Blancher, Nicolas R. F. [mailto:NBLANCHER@imf.org]
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2003 3:38 PM
To: Kim, Ji Youn
Subject: report

Dear Ms. Ji Youn Kim,

Since I am a new neighbor potentially affected by the Friendship Heights Traffic Study, I would be grateful if you could send me the electronic file of the full report presented at the June 25th public meeting on this topic.

Thank you,

Regards,

Nicolas Blancher

From: Martin Rojas [mailto:MRojas@trucking.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2003 5:48 PM
To: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov; Kim, Ji Youn; kpatterson@dccouncil.washington.dc.us;
Lucy.Eldridge@verizon.net; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; abauer4600@aol.com;
amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com
Subject: Proposed Traffic Pattern Change for 43 St. and Jenifer

To Whom It May Concern:

As a Friendship Heights neighbor who lives on 43rd Street, I am writing to object to the proposal of changing the direction of the traffic-diverter at the intersection of 43rd and Jenifer streets. After studying your proposed diagram, and as one who witnesses on a daily basis the constant traffic backups that already occur on Military Road, I can only imagine how much of Military's traffic would transfer over to Jennifer, traveling, of course, on 43rd Street to get there, in order to avoid sitting in the clogged-up mess of Military. Those of us who live on 43rd already face increased traffic and congestion due to the number of shoppers and diners parking on our street (there seems to be no parking validation at local garages for consumers?!?! in addition to vehicles that cut through 43rd to reach Wisconsin. However, I am willing to live with today's traffic pattern rather than consider the potential worsening of traffic on 43rd by drivers using it to reach Jenifer as an additional outlet to get to Reno and Connecticut Ave.

I am all for creating solutions to decrease traffic in our neighborhood (if that's even possible considering the expected level of housing development to take place in the next few years). In my view, I cannot possibly see how this proposed solution is not likely to exacerbate the problem rather than actually ease congestion or reduce traffic (a noble goal but in reality an almost unattainable one in this area.)

Thanks, I hope, for your consideration.

Martin Rojas
5347 43rd Street, NW

From: TROINC@aol.com [mailto:TROINC@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2003 5:20 PM
To: Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov
Cc: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov; Kim, Ji Youn; kpatterson@dccouncil.washington.dc.us;
Lucy.Eldridge@verizon.net; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; Abauer4600@aol.com;
AmyHoangDC3E02@aol.com; dickreed@compuserve.com
Subject: Re: Proposal to change traffic pattern on Jenifer and 43rd; Sept 4 meeting no...
Good afternoon, Marilyn,

Attached below is a copy of an email I sent to Colleen Smith on July 22, opposing the proposed alteration to the traffic diverter at 43rd & Jenifer. I will send it to the others on the list in your note. My concern and opposition continue, and I am prepared to work aggressively to see that this bad idea does not prevail.

Thanks for your leadership in this important issue.

Chip Levy
Jenifer St.

Good morning,

I have recently been made aware of a proposal to alter the traffic diverter at the intersection of 43rd and Jenifer Streets, NW. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed change.

As a long-time resident and property owner in the area (Jenifer @ 42nd Pl.), I have seen a substantial increase in non-resident traffic. My concern with the proposed change is that the revised traffic pattern would serve to increase traffic in the neighborhood, rather than manage or reduce it. Specifically, as eastbound traffic backs up on Military, especially in the evenings, opening an alternative pathway to Reno/Connecticut via 43rd would create a substantial increase in local traffic. We have already noted many cases of cars (and trucks) who turn off Military Road and use the alleys (via 43rd) and 42nd Pl & St to avoid the lengthy backup @ Reno. Additionally, the substantial Military Road traffic (in both directions) will significantly inhibit flow from 43rd turning left onto Military, which would obviously increase congestion there rather, than reduce it.

I'm sympathetic to the plight of 43rd St residents. I applaud efforts to improve traffic issues in the area -- it is problematic now and will only get worse as major construction begins in the area on both sides of Western. Any traffic planning should obviously include existing, proposed and potential projects on both the DC and MD sides. I take note of DC Strategic Plans that have concluded that there is substantial social value in preserving the residential character of the neighborhoods east of Wisconsin Avenue. In the short term, better signage management and increased enforcement seem warranted.

Thank you for your consideration of this position.

Sincerely,

Donald R. Levy

From: potttert [<mailto:potttert@erols.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2003 3:54 PM
To: Kim, Ji Youn
Cc: Colleen Smith; Lucy Eldridge ANC 3F03; DC Council Member Patterson; Reed G. Richard
Subject: Friendship Heights Traffic Proposal

Dear Ms. Kim:

The purpose of this email is to comment on recent Friendship Heights traffic control proposals.

My family has lived at 4231 Jenifer St. NW for more than 27 years. We purchased this house only after careful evaluation of traffic control measures in effect and planned at that time. Those measures were part of a comprehensive development plan that addressed zoning, commercial/residential mix, and traffic for a large area around the then-planned Friendship Heights metro stop, including the area on the Maryland side. The measures planned and ultimately implemented were judged to be the most reasonable measures likely to control effectively the intrusion of traffic onto quiet neighborhood streets. The plan was adopted only after extensive public involvement.

From the standpoint of control of impacts in our immediate locale, the existence and orientation of the traffic diverter at 43rd and Jenifer Streets was crucial, in our view. We are greatly concerned that the proposed reorientation of the diverter would substantially reduce its effectiveness. In particular, it would appear to us that, in the proposed reorientation, evening rush traffic eastbound on Military Road would be inclined to turn south on 43rd Street (therein partially defeating the purpose of the reorientation) and, following the reoriented diverter, would proceed east on Jenifer St., parallel to Military Road. This traffic would effectively bypass the evening rush Military Road backup that begins as one approaches the light at 41st St. Bypass traffic using Jenifer St. could proceed as far as Nebraska, or even farther, before re-entering Military Road.

We do not mean to suggest by these comments that plans and controls should never change. But we do believe that it is important to consider and incorporate appropriately in any new plans and proposals the scope, purpose, and effectiveness of plans and measures already in place.

I also note that where conflicting concerns arise, as is inevitable, fairness dictates that special weight be given to the numbers of people affected by various proposals and the extent to which impacts motivating proposed changes might or might not have been reasonable expectations at the time various groups of affected people made their real estate purchases.

The proposed reorientation of the diverter in question appears to address (and then only partially) the concerns of a very small group of people in one block on 43rd Street between Military Road and Jenifer St. The proposed measure risks increasing impacts on a much larger number of people in the larger neighborhood. Furthermore, it appears to us that the basic existing traffic control measures, (designed as part of the larger plan to sacrifice some control of traffic levels on that block in order to better control traffic in the neighborhood) were in place when all of these people purchased their homes. The levels of traffic in that block should have come as no surprise.

We would support measures that would provide better control of traffic in the block of concern, or in other areas, while simultaneously protecting the larger neighborhood. However, we believe the proposed reorientation of the diverter fails that criterion.

Sincerely,
Thomas and Julia Potter
4231 Jenifer St. NW
Washington, DC 20015
202-363-1268
potter@erols.com

From: Wilson Dizard [<mailto:Wdizard@postnewsweektech.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2003 10:52 AM
To: Kim, Ji Youn
Subject: Traffic Diverter at 43rd and Jenifer St. N.W.

Hello Ms. Kim:

I am writing to express my concern about and opposition to a proposal to rotate the traffic diverter at 43rd and Jenifer St. N.W. by 90 degrees. Contrary to the views of a vocal but unrepresentative group in the community, moving this traffic diverter in the manner proposed would worsen traffic, pollution, noise and

parking in the neighborhood. It also would put more fast-moving traffic traffic on Jenifer St., a street that now and historically has been home to a large number of children. Rotating the traffic diverter would cause a permanent traffic jam on 43rd St. south of Jenifer and on Ingomar St.--both very narrow streets. I urge you to oppose any modification of this traffic diverter. Please respond to my request either by return e-mail or by phone. You can reach me at 202-772-2583. I thank you for your attention to this matter. Best Regards, Wilson Dizard

Comments received after submittal of the Draft Report

-----Original Message-----

From: Marilyn Simon [mailto:Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2003 2:24 PM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT)

Subject: RE: Friendship Heights Transportation Study: Comments

Thank you for letting me know that it is available on the website, and I do appreciate that it is being posted in a more user-friendly manner than the last report.

Since I work during the day, I have only been able to take a quick look at it, and will not be able to study it before the meeting tonight. However, I used part of my lunch hour to download it and quickly look through, and was wondering if there some appendices and data missing.

For example, I had trouble determining when data was collected, and what was assumed to be included in the background when computing future traffic demands. For example, is the Chase Tower included as background.

In computing the traffic from new projects, what are the assumptions about workers per household and modal split?

Some of the information on use of on-street parking does not seem to reflect what I observe each morning as I leave my house, or my experience looking for parking spaces on weekends, so I would be interested in learning when the data was collected.

Also, unless I missed it, I didn't see any information or discussion on why the proposed recommendations are appropriate and why other recommendations had been rejected. In particular, there is no discussion of the merits of the proposal to rotate the traffic diverter if traffic on the collector street, the 4300 block of 43rd Street, is not reduced by the other methods. I also saw no discussion of the proposal to eliminate parking on the east side of the 5300 block of 43rd Street, which I think is the only likely way to reduce congestion on that block. Are those discussions in a missing appendix?

I expect to be able to review this more carefully later, and would appreciate having more information on the time-line, so that I can prepare comprehensive comments and provide them to you and the Council in a timely manner.

I will see you at the meeting tonight.
Marilyn Simon

-----Original Message-----

From: Frankel, David [mailto:DFRANKEL@ftc.gov]

Sent: Friday, September 05, 2003 2:00 PM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT)

Cc: Gina.Mirigliano@noaa.gov; pgb@tidalwave.net; Bachman, Janet; Chapman Todd; Lucy Eldridge; Amy Hoang; Lowrey.Bruce@hq.navy.mil; lowrey852@starpower.net; Marilyn Simon; Abauer4600@aol.com
Subject: FW: Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Dear Colleen:

It was nice to see you again yesterday evening at the latest public meeting on the Friendship Heights Transportation Study (the "Study"). While I appreciate your efforts to keep the community informed and to run a fair meeting, I was disappointed that the lengthy draft Study was not placed on the DDOT web site until yesterday, just hours before the meeting. I was not in my office yesterday and was therefore unable to skim, let alone read, the draft Study prior to the meeting. Given its length and the fact that the two extensive appendices have not been posted on the web site, it is difficult for me and others to provide meaningful public comment in only two weeks. Nevertheless, I attended yesterday evening's entire meeting and, based upon that presentation, provide the following comments for the public record. My comments reincorporate the comments I provided to you on June 27, 2003, as set forth in full at the bottom of this message. If I have additional time over the next few days to read the entire Study, including the appendices, at the Tenleytown Library, I may provide additional comments.

1. It seems to me that, with two exceptions, the focus of the Study, unfortunately, remains on the area east of Wisconsin Avenue and that the area west of Wisconsin Avenue was given relatively brief mention, despite efforts by me and others to shift this one-sided focus. This is particularly troublesome given the fact that there are at least two significant developments planned to the west of Wisconsin Avenue -- the WMATA proposal and the Martins Volvo/Ourisman Chevrolet proposal -- that will have very significant, negative traffic and parking effects. In addition, I understand that the Office of Planning is considering a proposal to add structured parking (i.e., a parking garage) behind Rodman's Drug Store on the west side of Wisconsin Avenue, in addition to several townhouses in that area. These various proposed developments will add significant traffic to our neighborhood and further pressure our limited on-street parking situation.
2. With respect to new proposals to add residential units to the Study area, I request that you tell me exactly how many new motor vehicles you estimate that each residential unit will generate. For example, how many cars do you estimate that each one bedroom apartment will generate? How many cars do you estimate that each two bedroom apartment will generate? Do you have different estimates between one bedroom apartments versus one bedroom condominiums or coops? Do you have different estimates between two bedroom apartments versus two bedroom condominiums or coops? Exactly where do your estimates come from?
3. With respect to new proposals to add retail space to the Study area, I request that you tell me exactly how many motor vehicles you estimate visiting the Study area for each new 1,000 square feet of space. Does the type of retail space impact on these estimates in any way? For example, does a grocery store generate more car trips than a boutique clothing store or a hairdresser? Exactly where do your estimates come from?
4. One of the two exceptions where the Study made a recommendation on the west side of Wisconsin Avenue -- the eased flow of westbound traffic on Western Avenue, directing it southward towards Jennifer Street and then south on Wisconsin Avenue -- is really just a means of reducing some of the existing congestion on the east side of Wisconsin Avenue. While I do not oppose this proposal, I merely want to point out that its primary purpose is NOT to reduce traffic for residents living on the west side of Wisconsin Avenue. Rather, it is designed to help the overall traffic flow in the entire Study area.

5. So, as I understand it, the ONLY Study recommendation designed primarily to assist residents living on the west side of Wisconsin Avenue is the proposal to modify the intersection of River Road/Fessenden Street/45th Street. I have no comments to offer on this particular Study recommendation at this time.

6. The Study makes no recommendations concerning the significant Monday through Friday truck traffic along Garrison Street, between Wisconsin Avenue and 44th Street, N.W. As I noted to you in June 2003, trucks make deliveries to Rodman's Drug Store from very early in the mornings (around 6:00 a.m.) to late in the day. Some of these trucks are large 18 wheel tractor trailers that make lots of noise, ruin our streets, spew out pollution, and kill our curbside trees. As I understand it, the Study did not even acknowledge that this is a problem -- when every resident on Garrison Street and some of the surrounding streets know quite well that it is a serious issue. Yesterday evening, you told us that the Study will make no recommendations regarding truck traffic until some other truck study is completed. I find this explanation unacceptable. If there is a truck problem -- which there certainly is on Garrison Street -- the Friendship Heights TRANSPORTATION Study should acknowledge this and make appropriate recommendations. Otherwise, this is not a TRANSPORTATION study, but rather is a study of something else.

7. The Study should recommend that the two green and white signs advising trucks not to use Garrison as a thru street be changed to make it illegal for such truck traffic along Garrison Street. In other words, trucks should be required to travel ONLY between Wisconsin Avenue and the Rodman's Drug Store loading dock area about 150 feet off Wisconsin Avenue. Any further truck travel to the west of the Rodman's loading dock area should be made illegal and enforced accordingly. Only trucks that are making deliveries to or picking up things from houses in the neighborhood should be permitted to use our residential streets.

8. Prior to yesterday's meeting, I asked June, one of the consultants with the Louis Berger Group, Inc., whether the time spent observing traffic along Garrison Street also attempted to measure the number of motor vehicles that drive illegally from Harrison Street to Garrison Street on the alley that parallels and is immediately to the east of 44th Street. She said that no attempt was made to calculate this. As I pointed out in my June 27th message, there are signs on Harrison Street announcing that this north to south use of that alley is illegal. Despite these signs, many, many cars and trucks travel on this alley illegally each day. I know, because the base of that alley is directly across from my house. Yet, the Study has made no recommendations to enhance enforcement efforts -- which have been non-existent during the 17 years I have lived on Garrison Street.

9. The contractors stated that no violations of the four way stop signs on the corner of Garrison Street and 44th Street were observed during their one day of observation. This result leads me to question whether anyone really made any observations. From my years of experience living about 150 feet from those stop signs, it is rare for motorists to obey them at all, unless a pedestrian is actually crossing the street at that intersection. The Study needs to recommend enforcement of those stop signs.

10. If anyone actually made observations on Garrison Street near 44th Street, I may be able to explain why speeding was not found to be a problem. In my experience, speeding is a problem on Garrison Street when there are fewer cars parked on it. This means, that speeding is a big problem in the evenings, late at night, early in the morning, and on weekends. If observations were made during a regular working day, I would not expect to see a lot of speeding.

11. The Study noted that there is a serious problem for motorists who seek to head northbound on Wisconsin Avenue from the west side of Garrison Street. I agree with this observation. I therefore propose that the Study recommend a sign making it unlawful to turn left onto Wisconsin Avenue from the west side of Garrison Street during certain hours of the day when Wisconsin Avenue traffic is particularly

heavy. I am opposed to the placement of a traffic signal at the intersection of Wisconsin Avenue and Garrison Street, because that will only encourage more motor vehicle traffic along Garrison Street. Fortunately, the Study did not recommend a traffic signal for this intersection.

I hereby request that my comments, including my comments of June 27, 2003 as set forth below, be considered and incorporated into the final Study.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Frankel
4336 Garrison Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016-4035
202-326-2812 (work)
dfrankel@ftc.gov (e-mail)

-----Original Message-----

From: Hazel F. Rebold [<mailto:hfrebold@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, September 07, 2003 8:52 PM
To: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov; Kim, Ji Youn; Kathy Patterson; abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; Lucy Eldridge
Subject: Friendship Heights Traffic Study

I attended the meeting on Thursday, September 4th, to learn more about the Friendship Heights Traffic Study and also to hear the comments of other neighbors.

I have written to you previously about my objection to rotating the traffic diverter at 43rd and Jenifer Streets, since the huge population to be added soon in new developments in Maryland would find the route from Military Road, then heading south onto the 5300 block of 43rd Street, to be a very attractive new way to go downtown. I feel this would make our current traffic problems even worse. It was clear from the meeting that many other neighbors strongly oppose any change to the diverter, and not one person spoke in favor of the idea.

I realize that any such change is considered a back-up plan, but I would like to see it removed as even an option for future consideration. There is no circumstance under which it would be an improvement, and I would like to not have to worry about dealing with this issue all over again.

Also, I would like to state that I live on Military Road at the corner of 43rd Street, and I keep a pretty good watch on both streets in the vicinity of my house. I find that the parking availability that is stated in your report, for both mornings (assuming after the start of business hours) and weekends (both Saturday and Sunday), does not reflect what I actually observe. There is rarely even one space available; if there is one, it is very quickly filled.

Hazel F. Rebold
4228 Military Rd. NW
(corner of Military Rd. and 43rd St.)

-----Original Message-----

From: Jack Edmondson [mailto:krysjacke@starpower.net]

Sent: Monday, September 08, 2003 2:53 PM

To: Mary Rouse; Beverley Monroe

Cc: Krystyna D. Edmondson

Subject: Intersection of Reno and Legation St. NW.

My wife and I are concerned about this intersection, especially driving north on Legation. It's often impossible to cross in a vehicle because of numerous cars parked on Reno road to the south of the intersection. Would it be possible for us to restrict parking on the East side of Reno to the South to within 75 feet from the intersection (Legation)? You just can't see if cars are coming from the South at the Military-Reno Road intersection because of parked cars.

It's also hard to cross Reno coming in the opposite direction from Legation going South. I know other folks on our street concur in this problem. I wouldn't object to a traffic light like we have on Livingston, yet that seems unlikely. Some jurisdictions use large round mirrors that might be placed on a telephone pole across the street looking south.

We seniors are still terrified about crossing Conn. Ave. at Morrison. The offenders mostly seem to be Marylanders, yet I wonder if the cross walks are enforced by anyone. Livingston street still poses a problem for the slow walkers. We are given just 16 seconds to make it across. I'd propose 25 if we can do that with the traffic people.

Thanks for your continuing good work.

Jack Edmondson

-----Original Message-----

From: Frankel, David [mailto:DFRANKEL@ftc.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2003 4:56 PM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT)

Cc: marilyn.simon@fcc.gov; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; Lucy Eldridge; Amy Hoang; Abauer4600@aol.com; pgb@tidalwave.net

Subject: Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Dear Colleen:

On September 5, 2003, I sent you my comments on the latest version of the Friendship Heights Transportation Study (the "Study"). As part of my comments, I requested that you provide me with information concerning some of the assumptions you and the consultants used in generating your data, models and conclusions. Specifically, I requested:

1. With respect to new proposals to add residential units to the Study area, I request that you tell me exactly how many new motor vehicles you estimate that each residential unit will generate. For example, how many cars do you estimate that each one bedroom apartment will generate? How many cars do you estimate that each two bedroom apartment will generate? Do you have different estimates between one bedroom apartments versus one bedroom condominiums or coops? Do you have different estimates between two bedroom apartments versus two bedroom condominiums or coops? Exactly where do your estimates come from?

2. With respect to new proposals to add retail space to the Study area, I request that you tell me exactly how many motor vehicles you estimate visiting the Study area for each new 1,000 square feet of space. Does the type of retail space impact on these estimates in any way? For example, does a grocery store generate more car trips than a boutique clothing store or a hairdresser? Exactly where do your estimates come from?

I have not heard back from you with responses to my questions. I request that you respond to my questions by close of business Friday, September 12, 2003, so that I may provide more detailed comments for the public record on the Study. In addition, I request that you add this e-mail message to the public record on the Study. Nothing in this message is meant to amend or modify the comments I have provided to you on September 5, 2003 and on June 27, 2003. I continue to stand by those comments as well.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Frankel
4336 Garrison Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016-4035
202-326-2812 (work)
202-326-3259 (fax)
dfrankel@ftc.gov (e-mail)

-----Original Message-----

From: jciw-centernet [mailto:jciw-centernet@erols.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2003 2:12 PM

To: colleen.smith@dc.gov

Subject: Friendship Heights Traffic Study

Following are comments and questions:

Re 8/3/03 draft report findings:

1. low utilization of bicycle racks and lockers: I think many people are concerned about safety and maintenance. Also, people who might cycle to metro will encounter dangerous traffic conditions on their way to metro and may find it an unsafe alternative.

2. vehicle speeding generally not a significant problem: sit on my front step in the 5300 block of 42nd St. long enough and you will see cars tearing down the block at unsafe speeds. It takes only one speeder to injure a child or an animal!

3. parking appears to be adequate: the underutilization of parking garages should be attributed to illegal parking on neighborhood streets - and the lack or short duration (1 hr.) of validation by merchants. One can't say parking is adequate if residential streets are bearing the brunt of transient parking.

With regard to the various recommendations:

1. As I (and others) said at the meeting there should be a 4 way stop at the intersection of Jenifer and 42nd Streets. I am surprised and angry that this recommendation, voiced at earlier meetings, was not included in the recommendations. It is a simple, low-cost solution to a very dangerous problem.

2. No credibility seems to be given to the reality that drivers want to keep moving. They will find alternate routes if they have to wait for lights. It may not be logical, but it is real. The proposals for the Wisconsin and Western intersection seem to me to miss the boat. Why would anyone who knows the area travel west on Western through the intersection and down to the street in front of Lord & Taylor (is that Jenifer?) to make a left taking them back to Wisconsin, when going left on Military and right on 43rd to Jenifer or 42nd to Harrison is more direct? It isn't just real time - it's the perception of time. The lack of left turn signals from Western to Wisconsin is resulting in dangerous movements (going north) and a convoluted route (going south.) If installing these results in a long queue, particularly northbound, so be it. Surely traffic experts can figure out how to time lights to mitigate this. And why are we in such a hurry to help people exit the District. The extended run of the left turn arrow from Wisconsin southbound to Western has been a big improvement and doesn't seem to have made traffic any worse! Sometimes simple solutions make the most sense!

3. Why has no one suggested no turn at rush hour signs - with cameras if necessary. Installing these at strategic places would discourage cut-through traffic; 43rd and Military, 42nd Street and Military; Wisconsin and Jenifer for starters.

Even if only a small percentage of the development, in Maryland as well as DC, currently under discussion were completed, the traffic situation would go from impossible to intolerable. And it will find its way quickly to residential streets in the area, those included in the study and many others nearby.

Question:

Are there any limitations on the 5300 block of 42nd Street NW that would prevent the installation of bumps, rumble strips, or other traffic calming devices.

I understand that the 5300 block of 43rd is not eligible for these measures.

Thank you for your help.

Jane Waldmann

-----Original Message-----

From: Marilyn Simon [mailto:Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov]

Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 4:53 PM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT); jkim@louisberger.com

Cc: abauer4600@aol.com

Subject: Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Colleen:

I had written you earlier with requests for specific information, and also with a request that you make the appendices available to the public. I have not received any response to my requests for information and I just spoke with the librarian at the Tenleytown library, who told me that she had not yet received the appendices.

Given that the community has not received the information required to comment on the Draft Report, I request that DDOT extend the public comment period to be 30 days from the date at which DDOT makes the Appendices available and answers the questions that it has received from the community.

I summarize below some of the questions that I have previously sent, as well as questions about unclear portions and clear errors in the draft report. These specifically refer to ambiguities which make it difficult for the community to interpret the information that is being presented or how it was derived. Clarification of these points is essential for the public to understand and comment on this critical report.

Please respond to my questions by close of business Monday, September 15, 2003, so that I may provide more detailed comments for the public record on the Study. In addition, I request that you add this e-mail message to the public record on the Study. Nothing in this message is meant to amend or modify my earlier comments. I continue to stand by those comments as well.

1. I had written you on September 5, requesting specific information on the traffic counts for the 5300 block of 43rd Street as well as the other blocks that likely would be affected by the proposal to rotate the traffic diverter at 43rd and Jenifer.

I have not yet received a response to this request. You had only responded that the data was available and somewhere in the Appendices. However, the Report which is available on-line includes information on what data was collected, and clearly indicates that the relevant data was NOT collected. Clearly, incomplete data was collected on the 5300 block of 43rd Street, no data was collected on Jenifer Street, no data was collected on the 5200 block of 43rd Street. The data that was collected on the 5300 block of 43rd Street is not comparable to the traffic volumes collected on the parallel blocks, although it is clear that the 5300 block of 41st Street carries significantly more traffic.

Specifically, it states that mechanical counts were taken at several intersections:

Mechanical Traffic Volumes: Traffic counts were collected using mechanical tube devices over a one-week period at six roadway segments: 1. Military Road, N.W. between Western Avenue and 41st Street; 2. Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. between Jenifer Street and Ingomar Street; 3. Western Avenue, N.W. between Livingston Street and Wisconsin Avenue; 4. 42nd Street N.W. between Jenifer Street and Ingomar Street; 5. 41st Street N.W. between Jenifer Street and Ingomar Street; and 6. River Road, N.W. between Fessenden and Ellicott Street.

Turning movement counts were taken for shorter periods for several intersections, only three of which can shed light on whether traffic on the 5300 block of 43rd Street is substantially heavier than traffic on any of the other nearby streets: Those intersections are: 6. Wisconsin Avenue at Jenifer Street, N.W. [of limited use, given that there are two garages at 5225 and 5301 Wisconsin with entrances on Jenifer]; 10. Military Road at 43rd Street, N.W.; 11. Military Road at 41st Street, N.W.; and 12. Military Road at Reno Road, N.W.

The counts were collected during morning (6:30AM-9:30AM) and afternoon (3:30PM-6:30PM) peak-periods, on a typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday) during March, April, and May 2003.

Field observation was conducted on the 5300 block of 43rd Street, and you reported only that the count was taken on June 12, 2003 from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM, and that they observed "over 1,400 vehicles", of which 28 or 2% were trucks or commercial vans.

I would like a complete response, by close of business September 15, as to what data was actually collected and how it demonstrates that the 5300 block of 43rd Street, a collector street, is carrying a significant higher amount of traffic than the other [local] streets that will be affected by this proposal or other traffic calming proposals that were mentioned at the meeting.

2. On September 2, 2003, I wrote you and stated that assurances by DDOT that the neighborhood's comments have been taken into account, without explanation, are NOT satisfactory. I asked you to specifically respond with explanations to the many concerns expressed to you about the effect of the rotation of the proposed traffic diverter in creating a new cut-through route, parallel to Military Road, that will be particularly attractive to people driving from Friendship Heights, MD and Bethesda to downtown Washington using Reno Road, a favored commuter route.

I would appreciate a complete response to this question as well as the other concerns raised in those comments. My question was first presented at the June 25 meetings and in my July 16 comments. The question was repeated in my September 2 comments. DDOT's response on this issue is necessary for the preparation of my comments.

3. In Chapter 3, Future Conditions, the underlying assumptions on trip generation are unclear. Also, there is not information provided that would indicate that the Minnesota study is relevant to Friendship Heights, or that any reductions due to transit usage should be taken as a fixed percentage reduction. Please provide an explanation as to how it was determined that the Minnesota study is relevant and exactly how the reductions were applied, and off of what base the reductions were made.

4. I had asked that you include estimates of future traffic, using as an assumption that actual vehicle ownership and data on commuting using private vehicles for this area that is available in Census 2000. I expect to see those estimates in the Final Report, and they should be made available in advance to the public for comment.

4. In Chapter 3, Exhibit 39, there is a computation of what appears to be net trips generated by the new development. Given that it does not indicate how many trips are assumed to be generated by the current use, and how many trips would be generated by the proposed use, it is difficult for the neighborhood to comment on the validity of this information. Please provide a breakdown for these charts showing, not only how much traffic is associated with existing and proposed uses, but also, please provide detailed information on how much traffic is associated with each component of the existing and proposed uses. For example, it is critical that the public know how much traffic is associated with the residential uses, the retail, separately for destination and neighborhood retail, components, the office components, and the other commercial components.

5. The Key on "Exhibit 12: Average Weekday and Weekend Daily Traffic Volumes" is mislabeled and it is impossible to interpret the numbers in the diagrams. Please provide the correct labels for the bar charts.

6. The intersections on Exhibit 14 are mislabeled. I think I have matched the proper data to the intersections, but that should be corrected so that the public can be certain they are commenting on the proper data.

7. The data in Exhibits 27 and 29, Weekday morning and Saturday on-street parking utilization, is clearly inaccurate. I have been observing parking here for some time, and since reading these two exhibits, took particular note of the parking available. I can confirm that sometime between 8:30 and 9:00 am, all the zone-three parking spaces on both blocks of 43rd Street and on Jenifer Street are taken, as well as almost all of the two-hour spaces. In addition, on Saturday, all day, and Sunday afternoon, there are no on-street spaces available on most of the blocks where it indicates that at least 33% [yellow] or in some cases 66% [green] of the spaces are available, and, in fact, drivers are circling the block and following pedestrians hoping to find an available space. Clearly, this underlying data is invalid and this should be corrected.

8. In my July 16 comments, I noted that the loading zone for 5225 Wisconsin Avenue, located on the 4300 block of Jenifer Street, does not provide access to the office building at 5225 Wisconsin Avenue. It only provides access to the restaurant kitchen. As a result, large trucks making deliveries to the offices, including medical offices, at 5225 Wisconsin use the 5300 block of 43rd Street for loading, frequently blocking the street. Even though this information was provided months ago, the issue was not addressed in the discussion of trucks or of loading areas. I believe further investigation of this issue is necessary.

I hope that the Appendices will be available at the Tenleytown library this weekend, and I will provide more complete comments when I have had a chance to review those documents and your responses to the above questions.

Sincerely,
Marilyn J. Simon
5241 43rd Street NW
Washington, DC
202-537-0114 (H)
202-418-2044 (W)
Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Marilyn Simon [mailto:Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov]

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 4:18 PM

To: Marilyn Simon; Smith, Colleen (DDOT); jkim@louisberger.com

Cc: abauer4600@aol.com; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; Marilyn (E-mail 2)

Subject: RE: Friendship Heights Transportation Study; parking utilization, error in data and error in Exhibit 29

Colleen:

In my September 11 e-mail, copied below, I noted that there seem to be serious errors in the data that was collected on parking utilization of the on-street spaces just east of Wisconsin Avenue.

1. Last Monday, September 15, I took several pictures of the Jenifer Street, 43rd Street and 42nd Place on my way to work. These pictures clearly show that the data collected for April 22 in the morning do not represent the typical morning parking situation.
2. I discuss below a problem with the methodology for determining utilization and available spaces.
3. I also note that Exhibit 29 contains serious errors which should be corrected and the corrected information should be reflected in the conclusions about parking availability.
4. There is a serious parking availability problem in this area, and it will be exacerbated by the planned development in the area.

Data collected for weekday morning utilization is inaccurate:

I checked the Appendices in the library again this weekend and note that they show the following utilization for April 22, AM:

43rd Street between Ingomar and Jenifer: 15 of 23 spaces used, 65% utilized [yellow]

43rd Street between Jenifer and Military: 15 of 45 spaces used, 33% utilized [green]

42nd Place between Jenifer and Military: 20 of 50 spaces used, 40% utilized [green]

Jenifer between 42nd and 43rd Street: 19 of 36 spaces used, 53% utilized [yellow]

As you can see from the attached photos, taken before 9 am on Monday Sept 15, nearly all of the spaces were used.

<<pkg 5200 and 5300 blocks of 43rd Street Sept 15 am.JPG>> <<Pkg 5300 block of 42nd Place Sept 15 am.JPG>> <<Pkg 5200 block of 43rd Street Sept 15 am.JPG>> <<Pkg Jenifer Sept 15 am.JPG>>

Error in methodology for determining available spaces:

I also want to comment on the methodology for determining the percentage of spaces utilized. There seem to be two areas in which the method does not accurately measure available spaces.

1. The consultants counted the number of spaces available if everyone parked properly and all vehicles were standard sized sedans. Frequently, if there is a larger vehicle, or if the vehicles are not properly spaced, this method would have it appear as though there are legal spaces available when there are none. When there are driveways, etc., the reduction in available legal spaces can be significant. The count should be performed again, on several dates, and the count should be based on actual legal spaces available, net of illegally parked cars. The percent utilization would be calculated by counting legal

spaces and subtracting illegally parked cars. The result would be divided by the capacity of the street. To get percent utilization, subtract from one.

2. Further, both blocks of 43rd Street include spaces on the west side of the blocks that are not standard Zone 3 spaces. There are two commercial spaces and several 2-hour spaces, even with a zone 3 permit on the 5200 block of 43rd. On the 5300 block of 43rd, there are four 2-hour spaces which are also 15-minute drop-off spaces for the day-care center. If a neighborhood resident is looking for a space near his or her home, or a Ward 3 resident is looking for a space for Metro or shopping, these spaces, if available, would not serve the purpose, and should not be included in the count of spaces available for neighborhood parking. That said, those spaces are usually occupied soon after the stores open.

Error in Exhibit 29:

There also seems to be a serious error in Exhibit 29, Saturday Parking Utilization Rates. After checking the data in the appendices in the library, I realized that the data collected on Saturday, May 3 indicates that all the spaces near the shopping district have very high utilization rates, even though the exhibit shows utilization below 66% for most blocks and below 33% for many. The utilization rates in the appendices are:

43rd Street between Ingomar and Jenifer: 27 of 23 spaces used, 117% [shown as yellow, 34-66% utilized]

43rd Street between Jenifer and Military: 47 of 45 spaces used, 104% [shown as red, 67-100% utilized]

42nd Place between Jenifer and Military: 47 of 50 spaces used, 96% [shown as yellow, 34-66% utilized]

Jenifer between 42nd and 43rd Street: 34 of 36 spaces used, 94% [shown as green, 0-33% utilized]

Clearly, the data indicates a parking problem, and the exhibits in the report and well as the conclusions based on those exhibits should be changed.

Omission of on-street parking utilization for Stonebridge and WMATA developments:

Further, as noted in my earlier message, there also do not appear to be any estimates of on-street parking requirements for the proposed developments. The Stonebridge development on the Washington Clinic site will have 125 condominiums plus a 3,000 square foot day care center. Just counting the resident vehicles that will not fit in the garage, there will be approximately 50 additional vehicles parked on the streets near that site, each qualifying for Zone 3 Permits. This is more than the total capacity of the 5300 block of 43rd Street. Looking at the weekend and PM measured space availability, which clearly overstates the number of spaces available, this is more than twice the number of spaces available on both blocks of 43rd Street, 42nd Place and Jenifer between 42nd and 43rd. This means that each available space in those blocks will be utilized and an additional 25 vehicles will be pushed onto further portions of Jenifer, 42nd Street and 41st.

In addition, I request that you add this e-mail message to the public record on the Study. Nothing in this message is meant to amend or modify my earlier comments. I continue to stand by those comments as well.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Simon

5241 43rd Street NW

-----Original Message-----

From: Marilyn Simon [<mailto:Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 12:01 PM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT); jkim@louisberger.com

Cc: Chapman Todd; Laurence.Freedman@usdoj.gov; Marilyn (E-mail 2); abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com

Subject: FH Transportation Study: Future Conditions, omission of Chase Tower.

Re: Traffic from the Chase Tower, 328 vehicles in both the morning and evening rush hours, was NOT included in the projections of future traffic conditions.

Colleen:

In my Sept 4, 2:24 pm e-mail, I asked about whether traffic from the Chase Tower was included in the projections in the Future Conditions section. Since I did not know when the traffic counts were taken, I could not determine what percentage of the building was included in the base counts. I raised the same issue at the Sept 4 community meeting, and was told that the Chase Tower would be included only as part of the assumed area growth in traffic. This is a major development, and it is inappropriate to exclude that traffic from the analysis or to consider it as part of regional growth.

I have now had an opportunity to examine the appendices for the FH Transportation Study, and determined that the traffic counts were taken at the beginning of March. I have attached a photograph of the building, taken on March 25, 2003 [which was filed with the Zoning Commission in April 2003], demonstrating that most of the offices in that building were vacant at the time, and clearly were vacant when the traffic counts were taken. In addition, I have listed below all tenants as of March 25, 2003, listed on the building directory with their suite numbers, illustrating that most (possibly all) floors are still vacant or only partially occupied:

AX Technology 1010
CapitalSource, CapitalSource Mortgage Finance LLC 1200
Cambridge Systematics 300
Chain Bridge Advisors LLC 1100
Lehrman LLC 1030
Medical Office Properties 1100
Salmon PCS, Crowley Group 1050
TAP Pharmaceuticals Inc. 710
Washington Radiology Associates PC 200

<<Chase Tower March 25 2003 with caption.JPG>>

I hope that the Report will be corrected to take into account this large volume of traffic which had been erroneously omitted from the current draft.

Marilyn Simon
5241 43rd Street, NW

I received your response to my earlier questions and believe that you might have misinterpreted some of the questions. I will respond in more detail later and will clarify my questions included in my September 11 e-mail.

I appreciate that you will be correcting the errors in several exhibits that I pointed out in my September 11 e-mail, and trust that you will also correct the errors in the exhibit on weekend parking that I brought to your attention in my more recent e-mail. I hope you will make the corrected information available to the community by posting it on the web-site.

-----Original Message-----

From: Frankel, David [<mailto:DFRANKEL@ftc.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 12:43 PM

To: Marilyn Simon; Smith, Colleen (DDOT); Kim, Ji Youn

Cc: Chapman Todd; Laurence.Freedman@usdoj.gov; Marilyn (E-mail 2); abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com

Subject: RE: FH Transportation Study: Future Conditions, omission of Chase Tower.

Dear Colleen:

Assuming that Ms. Simon's point is correct -- and I have no reason to doubt her -- it appears that she has uncovered a significant flaw in the assumptions upon which the Friendship Heights Transportation Study is based. I am very interested in your response.

Sincerely,

David P. Frankel
4336 Garrison Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016-4035
dfrankel@ftc.gov (e-mail)

-----Original Message-----

From: Marilyn Simon [<mailto:Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov>]

Sent: Friday, September 26, 2003 10:34 AM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT); Kim, Ji Youn

Cc: Frankel, David ; abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; Chapman Todd;

Lucy.Eldridge@verizon.net; Marilyn (E-mail 2); Laurence.Freedman@usdoj.gov

Subject: FH Transportation Study: Metropolitan Washington COG Trip Generation Study in FH.
Colleen:

In response to my question 5 on Exhibit 39 of Chapter 3, you cited a study by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Based on the information you provided, I cannot locate that study. In addition, I cannot determine from the cite when the trip generation study was done and in what context it was done.

I think that a copy of the study is essential for the community to evaluate the projections of future Levels of Service [LOS] with the proposed improvements.

Thus, I would appreciate it if you would:

- (1) provide me with more information on the COG study, including the date of the study, the developments analyzed, and the context of the study;
- (2) place a copy of the COG study at the Tenleytown library or at the reserve desk in the Washingtoniana Room of the MLK library;
- (3) place a copy of the Transit Cooperative Research Program, Research Results Digest cited in your response in either the Tenleytown library or the Washingtoniana Room;
- (4) provide a copy of the cited October 8, 2002 memorandum; and
- (5) inform the community of the availability of these materials by placing a notice on the Chevy Chase Listserve and the Tenleytown Listserve. If you do not have access to those listserves, I can place the notice there for you.

I have further questions about your response, which I will send later.

Thank you so much for your cooperation,
Marilyn Simon

5241 43rd Street, NW

Excerpt from DDOT Reponse: The Metropolitan Washington Council of Government (COG) performed a trip generation study in Friendship Heights, supporting a trip rate of 0.25 trips per dwelling unit and a 50 percent transit use. [FNs 2,3] The study noted that proximity to stations has a major impact on modal split. "If the worker was coming from Washington, D.C., the transit modal share was 52 percent...The study also found a number of housing projects near suburban Metrorail stations where the transit modal splits exceeded 50 percent...for work trips." [FN 4.]

FN2: District Department of Transportation Memo dated October 8, 2002, from Kenneth Laden to Andrew Altman.

FN 3: Transit Cooperative Research Program, Research Results Digest, June 1995, Number 7, "An Evaluation of the Relationships Between Transit and Urban Form".

FN 4: Ibid, page 31

-----Original Message-----

From: Frankel, David [<mailto:DFRANKEL@ftc.gov>]

Sent: Friday, September 26, 2003 11:00 AM

To: Marilyn Simon; Smith, Colleen (DDOT); Kim, Ji Youn

Cc: abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; Chapman Todd; Lucy.Eldridge@verizon.net; Marilyn (E-mail 2); Laurence.Freedman@usdoj.gov

Subject: RE: FH Transportation Study: Metropolitan Washington COG Trip Generation Study in FH.

Dear Colleen:

I join in Ms. Simon's request for this information. When I read the document you e-mailed to me as an attachment, I too wanted to review the source material upon which your supplemental information was based.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

David P. Frankel

4336 Garrison Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20016-4035

-----Original Message-----

From: Marilyn Simon [<mailto:Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov>]

Sent: Monday, September 29, 2003 10:19 AM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT); jkim@louisberger.com

Cc: abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; Chapman Todd; Frankel, David ; MJSimon524@aol.com; Laurence.Freedman@usdoj.gov; Lucy.Eldridge@verizon.net; Smithhemb@aol.com; Lowrey.Bruce@hq.navy.mil

Subject: FH Transportation Study

Colleen,

Thank you for your September 22 response to the questions in my September 11 e-mail.

Based on your responses, I am not certain that you fully understood the questions that I meant to ask, and in this e-mail I intend on clarifying those questions. In addition, for other responses, I am sending you my understanding of your response, to make sure that I fully understand DDOT's position.

1. I asked whether DDOT had collected any data that demonstrated that the 5300 block of 43rd Street that would support traffic calming measures targeted at that block. I also noted that, from the description in the Draft Report, it seemed that data to support traffic calming measures on that block were not collected.

DDOT responded: "Cut through traffic is a recognized problem. Although we were unable, due to budget constraints and time, to take traffic counts at every single block within the study area, we can look into the possibility of making this area a four-way stop through the standard traffic-calming petition and study process, and if it meets the warrants of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)."

Given the general conclusions of this response, I assume that I am correct in my belief that DDOT does not have the data necessary to recommend traffic calming measures targeted at the 5300 block of 43rd Street, NW. Therefore, I trust that DDOT will not add recommendations for new traffic calming measures targeted at that block in the next draft of the Report.

2. I asked you to specifically respond with explanations to the many concerns expressed to you about the effect of the rotation of the proposed traffic diverter in creating a new cut-through route, parallel to Military Road, that will be particularly attractive to people driving from Friendship Heights, MD and Bethesda to downtown Washington using Reno Road, a favored commuter route. On September 2, 2003, I wrote you and stated that assurances by DDOT that the neighborhood's comments have been taken into account, without explanation, are NOT satisfactory.

DDOT responded: "All public comments are carefully read and are noted. Although we may not directly respond to each and every comment, we do take them into account during our analysis."

It appears as though DDOT is not willing to directly address the community's concern that the proposal to rotate the diverter will provide an attractive alternate route through the 5300 block of 43rd Street and Jenifer Street to Reno Road. Unless these concerns are fully addressed, I believe that DDOT should take the proposal to rotate the diverter off the table completely.

3. I asked: "In Chapter 3, Future Conditions, the underlying assumptions on trip generation are unclear. Also, there is not information provided that would indicate that the Minnesota study is relevant to Friendship Heights, or that any reductions due to transit usage should be taken as a fixed percentage reduction. Please provide an explanation as to how it was determined that the Minnesota study is relevant and exactly how the reductions were applied, and off of what base the reductions were made."

DDOT responded:

"The Minnesota study[FN] is a comprehensive analysis of transit-oriented development and land use, drawing on extensive modeling and research. It was included to show a thoroughly-documented situation in which the availability of transit in suburban areas greatly increases transit trip rates. It is significant that the 23% to 33% increase in transit rates cited in the Minnesota study (page 102) is achieved with commuter rail and bus transit, which typically operates less frequently and for shorter hours of service than the Washington Metro. As you note, it is significant that this occurs in more suburban settings than Friendship Heights. The Transit Cooperative Research Program Research Results Digest, cited below in response to Question 5, is likely more pertinent to the study, although both are relevant."

Here, I suspect that you did not understand what I was asking. There were two parts to my question:

First, I was asking why DDOT considered the Minnesota study relevant to this area. I take it from your response that you recognize that the Minnesota study analysed a much more suburban area than Friendship Heights.

Second, I asked how the increases in transit use were applied. You stated that there is a 23% to 33% increase in transit rates, but you do not state specifically how you use those percentages to estimate transit

usage for the new residents, employees and customers that the proposed developments will attract to Friendship Heights.

Could you please provide a simple illustrative, numerical example? For example, you might just provide the community an example of how you would calculate transit usage and private vehicle usage for: (a) a new 100-unit rental building, with a floor area of approximately 120,000 square feet; and (b) a new retail building, with a floor area of approximately 100,000 square feet. With a simple numerical example, the community might understand how DDOT is using these reductions and came to its conclusions about the projected levels of service.

4. I had asked that you include estimates of future traffic, using as an assumption that actual vehicle ownership and data on commuting using private vehicles for this area that is available in Census 2000. I expect to see those estimates in the Final Report, and they should be made available in advance to the public for comment

DDOT responded: "Regarding the use of Census 2000 data: As you may know, the Census data from the long form collects information about work trips from approximately one out of six households. However, that data has limited relevance for the current study, since in general, work trips represent only about 20 percent of total vehicle trips. In addition, to-date only profiles have been published- not the full transportation planning package."

While I recognize that the Census only deals with vehicle ownership and commuting traffic, it provides valuable insights into these issues. It includes data on average number of vehicles per household, the number of workers per household and the modal split. According to Census 2000, there are approximately 1.4 vehicles per household in the area immediately adjacent to the Friendship Heights Metro. There are approximately 0.7 trips by private vehicle for each household in the morning and evening rush hours, and there are approximately 1.4 workers per household. While you state that these trips are just a small portion of the total vehicle trips, your estimates of total future traffic seem to be significantly less than what the Census data would predict for this small portion of total traffic.

If the community and the DC Council are to have confidence in your projections, it is critical that those projections be consistent with Census data for the area near the Friendship Heights Metrorail station, which already takes into account the proximity to Metro, household income and the number of workers per household. The other portions of the projections would be based on other estimates, although they should fully consider the fact that the Metrorail system is a commuter system, and many residents of the metropolitan area will rely on private vehicles for shopping and entertainment.

As noted above, I also requested that Census data be used in evaluating the parking requirements. As I stated in my earlier e-mail, the Stonebridge project, on the Washington Clinic site would have 50 more private vehicles than parking spaces. This issue needs to be addressed and I believe that your recommendations, while all appropriate, are woefully inadequate. At a minimum, DDOT should recommend that all new retail development requiring zoning approval offer at least two hours of free validated parking, or more if indicated by the proposed use. In addition, DDOT should review all the transportation plans for PUDs in the area to determine whether they are required to provide validated parking and to take enforcement actions where appropriate. In addition, for all new residential development requiring zoning approval, DDOT should consider applying the conditions, listed below, that were used for the PUD at 5333 Connecticut Avenue, NW [Zoning Commission Order 656]. As the Census 2000 data indicates, household in our community have, on average 1.4 vehicles, so all new residential development, subject to zoning approval, should have a minimum of 1.4 parking spaces per unit. Further, DDOT should determine whether it is appropriate to have a resident parking program subzone near the Friendship Heights Metro, possibly included the entire area associated with this Study.

5. I wrote:

"In Chapter 3, Exhibit 39, there is a computation of what appears to be net trips generated by the new development. Given that it does not indicate how many trips are assumed to be generated by the current use, and how many trips would be generated by the proposed use, it is difficult for the neighborhood to comment on the validity of this information. Please provide a breakdown for these charts showing, not only how much traffic is associated with existing and proposed uses, but also, please provide detailed

information on how much traffic is associated with each component of the existing and proposed uses. For example, it is critical that the public know how much traffic is associated with the residential uses, the retail, separately for destination and neighborhood retail, components, the office components, and the other commercial components."

Perhaps my question here was not clear. Table 39 gave net changes in traffic, the difference between the current use and the proposed use. For example, for the Buick site, DDOT found that 5 fewer vehicles would enter the site in the AM, and 19 additional vehicles would exit the site in the AM, etc. My question related to how these numbers were derived: Specifically, how many vehicles is DDOT assuming currently leave and enter the Buick site in the AM and in the PM? I also was asking that these numbers further be broken down, so that for sites with multiple uses, the community knows how many vehicles are assumed to enter and leave the commercial and the residential components of each mixed use site. So, basically, I am asking that you provide the community with the building blocks that you would have used to get the results you are reporting. The table would look something like the following:

Development	AM			PM		
	in	out	total	in	out	total
Buick Site:						
Current use: [provide info on square footage, units and/or other relevant measures in each use.]						
[1] Car Dealership	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Proposed use:						
[2] Condominium	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
[3a] Retail-destination	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
[3b] Retail-local	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
[3c] Commercial-office	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
[4] Total	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Buick Site: Subtract row 1 from row 4						
Net:	-5	19	14	18	8	26

Washington Clinic, etc, same calculations as above.

It would be useful in explaining the above, if DDOT would actually state the assumed number of vehicle trips in each hour associated with each use, i.e., how many trips per square foot for office space, retail space, and residential space, and in what time period are those trips assumed to be made.

5, 6. The Key on "Exhibit 12: Average Weekday and Weekend Daily Traffic Volumes" is mislabeled and it is impossible to interpret the numbers in the diagrams. Please provide the correct labels for the bar charts. The intersections on Exhibit 14 are mislabeled. I think I have matched the proper data to the intersections, but that should be corrected so that the public can be certain they are commenting on the proper data.

Thank you for clarifying this and for correcting these errors in the final draft.

7. I commented on the parking data, and I had written additional e-mails providing photographs of the streets in question and also pointing out that the exhibits in the text are not consistent with the data in the appendices, and in fact, the exhibit for Saturday parking, all the streets just east of Wisconsin should be colored red, and in fact the data shows that both blocks of 43rd Street, 42nd Place and Jennifer Street all have parking utilization rates from 94%-117%.

DDOT responded: This is a small snapshot of the parking situation. Some days there will be more parking available and some days less. However, we are comfortable with our recommendations for parking which include:

- Stronger and more consistent enforcement

- Cooperation with stores to have them validate one to two hour shopping trips to increase utilization of surface lots and garages and decrease on-street parking by shoppers.

- Separate marked parking areas for service vehicles

- Consistent signage

As stated above, I agree with all the above recommendations, but believe that they are grossly insufficient. As noted in 4, above, additional measures are required.

8. I repeated a point that I raised in my July 16 comments:

"In my July 16 comments, I noted that the loading zone for 5225 Wisconsin Avenue, located on the 4300 block of Jennifer Street, does not provide access to the office building at 5225 Wisconsin Avenue. It only provides access to the restaurant kitchen. As a result, large trucks making deliveries to the offices, including medical offices, at 5225 Wisconsin use the 5300 block of 43rd Street for loading, frequently blocking the street. Even though this information was provided months ago, the issue was not addressed in the discussion of trucks or of loading areas. I believe further investigation of this issue is necessary."

DDOT responded: This issue is also one of enforcement. DDOT will also work with the building management at 5225 to see if they can/will allow other deliveries in their block.

I appreciate your willingness to work with the building management to use the required loading area to serve the office building, rather than using the 5300 block of 43rd Street, a residential street, as the loading area for the office component of this large building.

I request that you please respond to this message, including answers to the my earlier questions three through five, which I clarified above, by the morning Friday, October 3, 2003. In addition, I further request that these comments be placed on the public record and be considered in addition to my previous comments on the Study.

Thank you so much for correcting the charts and for your willingness to work with the owners of 5225 Wisconsin Avenue to correct the configuration of their loading area and to remove that activity from the abutting residential street.

Thank you,

Marilyn Simon

5241 43rd Street NW

For 5333 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. PUD [Z.C. Order 656, Case No. 89-15C, March 12, 1990], the Zoning Commission included the following terms and conditions as part of its decision:

14. The following terms and conditions set forth in the November 30, 1989 Agreement between the Applicant and the Square 1873 Committee shall apply:

a. Parking

i. The proposed building shall provide at least 234 interior parking spaces (at least 204 spaces reserved for residents and 30 spaces for visitors). The developer agrees to use his best efforts to increase the total number of parking spaces to 248.

ii. The total top level parking (an amount not less than 30 parking spaces) inside the building shall be dedicated to visitor/non-resident parking on a 24-hour basis.

iii. Each rental lease (or subsequent condominium title) shall clearly state that all residents of 5333 Connecticut Avenue shall be ineligible for the life of their lease (or title) to obtain District of Columbia Department of Public Works residential street parking permits.

iv. Each lessee of the building shall submit to the management a fully completed application form prior to signing a lease, which will include but not be limited to disclosure of automobile ownership information.

v. Each rental lease (or subsequent condominium title) shall clearly refer to a parking license agreement. The parking license agreement shall assign one parking space per unit and shall set forth the other terms and conditions of the parking agreement. If, however, no tenant of a particular unit has an automobile, such tenant(s) may waive his or her (their) right to such assigned parking space.

vi. If there are additional parking spaces in the building, above the number of any unleased units, the management of the building will use best efforts to encourage the leasing of those additional spaces.

vii. The rental lease shall include the following language unless subsequent language is mutually agreed upon by both parties: "Apartment (Condominium) no. ____ shall be assigned parking space no. ____ in the building. This lease is subject to the terms and conditions of a parking license agreement. The parking fee per month shall be \$ _____. This parking fee shall not be waived unless the lessee does not have an automobile.

-----Original Message-----

From: Frankel, David [<mailto:DFRANKEL@ftc.gov>]

Sent: Monday, September 29, 2003 11:33 AM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT)

Cc: abauer4600@aol.com; amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; Chapman Todd; MJSimon524@aol.com;

Laurence.Freedman@usdoj.gov; Lucy.Eldridge@verizon.net; Smithhemb@aol.com;

Lowrey.Bruce@hq.navy.mil; Marilyn Simon; Kim, Ji Youn

Subject: Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Dear Colleen,

I have just read the questions and public comments submitted to DDOT through you by Marilyn Simon (attached below) on the Friendship Heights Transportation Study (the "Study"). I join in all of Ms. Simon's comments and want to emphasize some of the points she has made.

I cannot emphasize enough how important it is that DDOT and its consultants (Louis Berger) use the most accurate and relevant data upon which to base the various assumptions that underly the Study. From what I understand the Census 2000 data indicate that people already living in our neighborhood own, on average, 1.4 motor vehicles per household. Thus, unless you have strong evidence to the contrary, this figure should be the MINIMUM figure used to predict the number of motor vehicles that new residents will themselves bring to our neighborhood. I would like to explain why I believe the 1.4 figure is a MINIMUM for planning purposes.

The Friendship Heights and Tenleytown areas have been experiencing greatly increasing household incomes, property values and renovation activity over the past decade. As more moderate income families or elderly residents leave the neighborhood, new, often younger, residents take their places. I believe this trend can be demonstrated by merely looking at the ever increasing enrollment of Janney Elementary School and the addition of, I believe, two temporary trailers on that school's grounds to accommodate our area's children. Given the higher household incomes of the newer residents, it is only logical to expect them to have, on average, more motor vehicles than their predecessors. For example, when I purchased my house in 1986, I purchased it from the original owner, a widow in her 80's. She did not own an automobile. I, however, owned and still own a car. My next door neighbor is an elderly widow in her 80's who does not own a car, but who lives alone in a three bedroom, 2.5 bath single family detached house. When she leaves the neighborhood, I would expect the new owners to have at least one and perhaps more cars.

As I have written before, it is my understanding that the Study is designed to deal not only with traffic flow, but also with parking issues. I also understand from the two community meetings I attended that you organized, and at which the Louis Berger consultants made presentations, that the Study is supposed to project the traffic flow and parking situation up to ten years into the future. From what I have been hearing about the proposed WMATA, Buick, Babes and Martin's Volvo developments, there is discussion of adding hundreds of new residential housing units within and just outside the Study area over the next five years or so.

One area of concern for me and others living in the Study area is where the new residents in those proposed developments and their guests and people performing services for them (e.g., plumbers, electricians) or making deliveries (e.g., furniture) will park their vehicles. It seems to me that each

residential unit will generate a minimum of 1.4 motor vehicles, just from their residents -- not including guests, service providers and deliveries.

We need to understand the assumptions that underly the Study in this regard. If they are lower than 1.4 motor vehicles per residential unit, we need to understand why. And, of course, we need to know where you expect these people to park.

I request that this message be placed on the public record.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Frankel
4336 Garrison Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016-4035
dfrankel@ftc.gov (e-mail)

-----Original Message-----

From: Marilyn Simon [mailto:Marilyn.Simon@fcc.gov]

Sent: Thursday, October 09, 2003 5:30 PM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT); Kim, Ji Youn; Simpson-Mason, Ann (DDOT)

Cc: amyhoangdc3e02@aol.com; abauer4600@aol.com; Lucy Eldridge; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; Laurence.Freedman@usdoj.gov; Frankel, David ; Lowrey, Bruce F; Smithhemb@aol.com; MJSimon524@aol.com; Marilyn Simon

Subject: Friendship Heights Draft Transportation Study: Comments

Colleen:

Thank you for placing a copy of "Preliminary Estimates of Additional Trips Generated by Proposed Developments" in the Tenleytown library this past weekend. I am providing here some general comments on the Draft Study, as well as particular comments based on my review of the information that you just provided in response to my September 11 request for this data and my September 29 clarification of the request.

I request that these comments be placed in the public record and be considered in addition to my previous comments on the Draft Study. I also request that the corrected version of the Future Conditions be considered as a draft only until the community has had a reasonable opportunity to review the corrections.

General Comments:

(1) The trip generation rates used in the Draft Study, and confirmed in my review of "Preliminary Estimates," are not consistent with Census 2000 data for this area. As I discussed in my earlier e-mails, the traffic generation that is assumed in this study is NOT consistent with the data collected in Census 2000. In your September 22 Response, you stated that Census only collects data on work trips and stated: "However, that data has limited relevance for the current study, since in general, work trips represent only about 20 percent of total vehicle trips." The information in the Census is useful for estimating the commuting trips made per household in the morning and evening rush hours. It is also useful for estimating vehicle ownership, which is just one portion of the demand for parking. However, your estimates for total trip generation is substantially less than what the information from Census 2000 would predict for the commuting portion of trip generation.

Thus, using Census 2000 data as a "reality check" clearly indicates that the number of projected trips the Draft Study is far below any reasonable estimate of the number of trips that actually would be generated by the proposed residential developments. If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate

picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future residential development, trip generation rates must be consistent with Census 2000 data on commuting choices.

(2) Trip reductions: In the analysis, there was a 50% trip reduction taken for commuting trips out of the neighborhood, as well as for all other trips. While the 50% trip reduction might apply to commuting trips by residents, it clearly would not apply to other trips. DDOT has provided no studies to support a 50% trip reduction for this area for commuting trips into the neighborhood, or for trips related to business, shopping and entertainment. Further, the trip generation numbers for commuting trips out of the neighborhood are unrealistic, as noted below.

(3) Vehicle Peak Hour Trip Generation Rates for Office and Retail uses are approximately half the Vehicle Peak Hour Trip Generation Rates used by the Montgomery County Planning Board for developments in the Friendship Heights CBD: In combination, the DDOT trip generation rates and DDOT trip reductions produce DDOT "vehicle peak hour trip generation rates" that are significantly lower than the "Vehicle Peak Hour Trip Generation Rates" approved and adopted by the Montgomery County Planning Board in July 2002. Vehicle trip generation rates for the Silver Spring, Bethesda, and Friendship Heights CBDs were computed, and the report specifically stated that these rates reflect higher transit use in these areas.

Specifically:

(A) For Office Use in Friendship Heights, Montgomery County requires the following vehicle trip generation rates be used:

For the AM peak hour: 1.50 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 85% are In and 15% are Out.

For the PM peak hour: 1.50 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 25% are In and 75% are Out.

The DDOT submission assumed the following vehicle trip generation rates for Office Use, including office use at the Chevy Chase Center, GEICO and Hecht's sites, all in the Montgomery County Friendship Heights CBD:

For the AM peak hour: 0.78 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 88% are In and 12% are Out.

For the PM peak hour: 0.745 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 17% are In and 83% are Out.

DDOT's assumed vehicle generation rates for office use are approximately half the rate that the Montgomery County Planning Board has determined is appropriate for the Friendship Heights CBD, the area immediately surrounding the Friendship Heights Metrorail Station.

(B) For Retail Use in Friendship Heights, Montgomery County requires the following vehicle trip generation rates be used:

For the AM peak hour: 0.65 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 50% are In and 50% are Out.

For the PM peak hour: 2.60 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 50% are In and 50% are Out.

The DDOT submission assumed the following vehicle trip generation rates for Retail Use, including retail use at the Chevy Chase Center, Buick and WMATA sites, although somewhat different rates [although significantly below the rates required for use in Montgomery County] were used for the retail use at the Hecht's site:

For the AM peak hour: 0.35 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 58% are In and 42% are Out.

For the PM peak hour: 1.30 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 43% are In and 57% are Out.

DDOT's assumed vehicle generation rates for retail use are approximately half the rate that the Montgomery County Planning Board has determined is appropriate for the Friendship Heights CBD, the area immediately surrounding the Friendship Heights Metrorail Station.

(C) For Grocery Store Use in Friendship Heights, Montgomery County requires the following vehicle trip generation rates be used:

For the AM peak hour: 1.22 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 70% are In and 30% are Out.

For the PM peak hour: 6.20 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 50% are In and 50% are Out.

The DDOT submission assumed the following vehicle trip generation rates for Grocery Store Use, in the Chevy Chase Center in the Montgomery County Friendship Heights CBD:

For the AM peak hour: 1.625 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 61% are In and 39% are Out.

For the PM peak hour: 5.744 trips per 1,000 SF, of which 51% are In and 49% are Out.

The DDOT vehicle trip generation rates are comparable to the Montgomery County Planning Board rates,

but DDOT neglected to use these rates for the supermarket [Whole Foods] that is planned for the Hecht's site, and instead DDOT applied the lower retail rates.

(4) Parking: As I had stated earlier [September 22] e-mail, the methodology used to collect on-street parking utilization is flawed, and overstates the number of spaces available. I also pointed out that the parking utilization analysis did not take into account the fact that residents of the development on the Washington Clinic site will own an estimated 50 more vehicles than can be accommodated on-site.

Further, you stated in your October 2 response: "Our AM parking utilization rate was collected from 7:20AM to 8:00AM." Much of the morning on-street parking is used by Ward 3 residents that drive to the Friendship Heights Metro or drive to work in Friendship Heights. In any event, the Friendship Heights Metro is a 20-30 minute ride to many downtown offices, and many businesses in Friendship Heights don't open until 9 am or later. Ward 3 commuters that use the on-street parking arrive much later than the time at which your data was collected. On weekdays, the on-street spaces closest to the Metro begin to fill up around 8:30 am, and on-street parking is largely unavailable by 9 am. On weekends, spaces are largely unavailable all-day Saturday and Sunday afternoon. This is supported by your data, and will be shown on the exhibits, when they are corrected to be consistent with the data in the appendices.

While I agree with your recommendations on parking, I still do not believe that they go far enough. In your October 2 response, you stated that you would be adding recommendations for handling parking: "In addition to the recommendations included in the draft report, the final report will recommend that DDOT set an adequate parking requirement agreement with proposed developments and review existing PUD parking agreements to ensure compliance with their agreements." I commend you on that addition, but urge you to go further in detailing how you would be defining an adequate parking requirement. For residential developments, I think that the Zoning Order 656 provides a useful template for assuring that on-site parking is provided in residential developments subject to zoning approval, but that residents that choose not to own vehicles are not treated unfairly. I provided the text of that Zoning Commission Order in my September 29 e-mail. For commercial development, I think that it would be appropriate for the Study to provide guidance for the number of on-site spaces that should be provided for employees and for customers or clients, and to recommend that all new commercial development, subject to zoning approval, be required to offer validated parking for its customers, two-hours for most types of businesses, although less for others, such as dry cleaners, and more for restaurants and movies and other types of businesses for which two-hours of validated parking is not sufficient to entice customers to use an on-site parking facility.

Comments on the data provided on proposed development trip generation:

I have now had an opportunity to briefly review those tables, and have a better understanding of how the numbers in the Draft Study were derived. However, this new information raised more questions than it answered:

(A) In my review of those tables and as noted above, I found that the trip generation figures do not accurately reflect the use of private vehicles in this area.

(B) In addition, I found numerous errors in the tables, including errors in the characterization of current development and the characterization of planned development. The serious errors that I discovered in a quick review are listed below.

The inaccurate trip generation figures for each type of development as well as the serious inaccuracies in the characterization of current or planned development has the effect of producing overly optimistic projections of future levels of service in the 2008 and 2013 "build scenarios."

(1) In my October 5 e-mail, I noted that the Chase Tower at 4445 Willard Avenue, Chevy Chase, Maryland, just a few hundred feet from the study area, was completed, but largely unoccupied at the time the traffic counts were taken. Traffic from this 12-story building was not included in the traffic counts and was not added as new development. If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future development, the traffic associated with

this building, using the MC trip generation rates, approximately 354 vehicle peak hour trips in the morning and 354 vehicle peak hour trips in the evening rush hours, must be included in the analysis.

(2) Washington Clinic Site: In your analysis of the proposed development at the Washington Clinic Site, you find that 125 condominiums and a day care center [with 44 children, 7 full time employees, 6 part-time employees and additional summer staff of 3] will generate fewer rush hour trips than the vacant lot that was on the site in early March when the traffic counts were taken. You claim that a vacant lot will generate 44 more morning peak trips and 46 more evening peak trips than 125 condominium units and a 44-child day care center.

Earlier, you referred us to the record in Zoning Commission Case 02-17. In that case, on behalf of the developer, a day care provider submitted information on the number of children that were dropped off by private vehicle at the current location and the mode of transportation used by the staff at the current location. They then projected the anticipated traffic for the additional location at the Washington Clinic site. The child drop-offs and staff arrivals are concentrated at rush hour, and they estimated that 7.5 workers would drive to the new day care center and 2.25 workers would be dropped off [each generating an entry and an exit from the site]. They also estimated that 39 vehicles would drop off 41 children, generating 39 trips in and 39 trips out of the site.

For the 125 condominiums, it is reasonable to assume that these units will, like the rest of the neighborhood with similar housing prices, have 1.4 workers per household, of which at least half will commute to work using private vehicles. This means that there would be approximately 87.5 vehicles used for commuting. Census data for the community also shows that departure times are quite concentrated, with close to half of the commuters leaving their residence at rush hour. This would give an estimate of approximately 44 vehicles leaving the premises at the peak hour, just for commuting, compared with the 27 vehicles, for commuting and all other purposes, assumed using the ITE estimate with the 50% trip reduction. A similar issue arises with each of the residential calculations included in the Draft Study.

Clearly, there are serious errors with the calculation of traffic generated by development of the Washington Clinic site, replacing a vacant lot, as existed on the site in early March, with 125 condominiums and a day care center for 44 children. If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future development, these errors must be corrected in the Final Report.

(3) Buick Site: The current use is listed as a car dealership and includes a substantial amount of traffic into the site in the morning and out of the site in the evening. The Chevy Chase Buick/Hyundai dealership was associated with Chevy Chase Cars in Bethesda, Maryland, and at some point, repair work at this site was discontinued and moved to the Bethesda location. A November 12, 2002 Wall Street Journal article cites "Steve Gorogias, service manager at Chevy Chase Buick/Hyundai in Maryland." The Buick dealership was closed entirely sometime in the Spring 2003. The property was sold on April 8, 2003. I do not know whether service was being offered at 5220 Wisconsin Avenue at the time the traffic counts were taken. DDOT should determine when service was discontinued and when the dealership was closed. Further, there is a trip reduction of 50% for trips to the retail portion of the proposed development, and it is not clear if the trip generation estimate, even before the reduction was applied, is appropriate. In addition, as with the Washington Clinic site, trip generation for the residential portion of the proposed development is inconsistent with Census 2000 Data.

If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future

development: (1) DDOT should determine the actual use of the site when the traffic counts were taken and adjust its estimate accordingly; (2) DDOT should remove the 50% trip reduction from the retail trip generation estimates for future traffic; (3) DDOT should use the vehicle trip generation rates for the Friendship Heights CBD; and (4) DDOT should adjust the trip generation estimates for the residential portion of the new development to be consistent with Census 2000 data.

(4) WMATA: As with the Buick and Washington Clinic sites, the trip generation for the residential portion of this development is not consistent with Census 2000 data. As with the Buick site, there is no justification for the 50% trip reduction for the retail portion of the development.

If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future

development: (1) DDOT should remove the 50% trip reduction from the retail trip generation estimates for future traffic; (2) DDOT should use the vehicle trip generation rates for the Friendship Heights CBD; and

(3) DDOT should adjust the trip generation estimates for the residential portion of the new development to be consistent with Census 2000 data.

(5) Chevy Chase Center: Earlier this year, the developers of the Chevy Chase Center began removing retailers from the Center in anticipation of beginning construction in 2003. Many of the retail businesses had already left the Chevy Chase Center by early March 2003 when the traffic counts were taken. The estimates provided for traffic with existing development were based on normal vacancy rates. Clearly, the vacancy rates were quite high in March 2003. However, the Chevy Chase Center does have controlled access to its parking lot on weekdays, and should be able to provide accurate data on how many vehicles enter and exit the parking lot in the morning and evening rush hour.

In addition, like the Buick and WMATA sites, there is no justification for the 50% trip reduction for the commercial components of this site: office, retail and supermarket.

If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future

development: (1) DDOT should adjust the trip generation for existing development to account for the excessive number of vacancies in anticipation of new construction; (2) DDOT should use the vehicle trip generation rates for the Friendship Heights CBD; and (3) DDOT should remove the 50% trip reduction from the retail trip generation estimates for future traffic and from the office trip generation estimates for future traffic.

(6) Hecht's Site: A Whole Foods Market [a supermarket] is planned for this site as part of the retail component. This is not included in the proposed development. It is clear that a supermarket generates significantly more vehicular traffic than other retail, and the use for the proposed development should be adjusted. As with the earlier sites, the trip generation associated with the residential portion of the site is not consistent with Census 2000 data, and DDOT should adjust those numbers to account for both the commuting trips that would be indicated by the Friendship Heights, Maryland Census data, as well as the non-commuting trips for high rise apartments. In addition, there was no justification for the 50% trip reduction for the office and retail components on this site.

If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future

development: (1) DDOT should adjust the trip generation estimates for the residential portion of the new development to be consistent with Census 2000 data; (2) DDOT should use the vehicle trip generation rates for the Friendship Heights CBD; and (3) DDOT should remove the 50% trip reduction from the retail trip generation estimates for future traffic and from the office trip generation estimates for future traffic.

(7) GEICO site: Existing development on this site is listed as "office-headquarters," and includes a significant number, 265 after trip reduction, of trips out of the site in the morning peak hour. It is not clear to me that this is the appropriate characterization of this site, while it is the GEICO headquarters building, it does not seem to fit the profile assumed. GEICO, an insurance company, probably maintains records on how many commuters to their headquarters commute by automobile. They also probably maintain information on how many of their employees use private or company vehicles during the day and how many would be exiting the site during the peak morning hour. I think it is appropriate for DDOT to contact GEICO and determine what an appropriate measure of current peak traffic is.

As with the earlier sites, the trip generation associated with the proposed residential portion of the site is not consistent with Census 2000 data, and DDOT should adjust those numbers to account for both the

commuting trips that would be indicated by the Friendship Heights, Maryland Census data, as well as the non-commuting trips for high rise apartments. In addition, there was no justification for the 50% trip reduction for the office component on this site.

If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future development: (1) DDOT should adjust the trip generation estimates for the residential portion of the new development to be consistent with Census 2000 data; (2) DDOT should use the vehicle trip generation rates for the Friendship Heights CBD; (3) DDOT should determine what the appropriate trip generation information for the existing use is; and (3) DDOT should remove the 50% trip reduction from the office trip generation estimates for future traffic.

(8) Other undeveloped or underdeveloped sites: Currently, there are three sites near the Friendship Heights Metro that are current undeveloped or developed at levels far below that allowed by current zoning. The parking lot between Lord & Taylor and Mazza Gallerie is zoned C-3-A, which, as a matter of right would allow development with a maximum floor area ratio of 4.0, of which at most 2.5 can be non-residential. The multi-level parking garage behind Lord and Taylor is zoned R-5-B, which would allow, as a matter of right, development of a residential building with a height of 50 feet and a floor area ratio of 1.8. Lord & Taylor is on land that is zoned C-2-A, which would allow for a maximum floor area ratio of 2.5, of which at most 1.5 can be non-residential.

If the DDOT projections are to provide an accurate picture of how much traffic will be generated by present and planned future development, DDOT should at least include, in its analysis, development of these sites up to the level which is allowed without additional zoning approval.

Minor Points:

(1) On 5225 Wisconsin Avenue, you stated: "This issue is also one of enforcement. DDOT will also work with the building management at 5225 to see if they can/will allow other deliveries in their block." I just want to make certain that you realize that the issue is not about an existing hallway or entrance to which building management has denied access. The only access from the loading dock into the building is through the restaurant kitchen. There is another driveway near the loading dock, where the Buicks were parked. I do not know if there is access to the building from that portion of the garage.

(2) On page 73 of the draft study, you offer two long-term alternatives for improvement of the Military Road/41st Street/Reno Road intersection. In order to provide more green-time for Military Road traffic, you are considering either cutting off access to 41st Street below Military Road, or making 41st Street below Military Road one-way south-bound. I would like to point out that, on weekdays, the 5200 block of 41st Street carries approximately 1,500-1,600 vehicles a day northbound, and approximately 1,200-1,300 vehicles a day southbound. I presume that the 5300 block of 41st Street carries a similar volume, if not more. This seems to be a substantial amount of traffic, which would be diverted to other neighborhood streets if access between 41st Street and Military Road were to be limited. This block also is critical for residents east of Wisconsin, but below Military Road, as a critical route in order to cross either Military Road or Reno Road at a signalized intersection.

(3) On page 95 of the Draft Study, you state: "Transportation improvements discussed in this report, in tandem with signal optimization will significantly improve the signalized intersections studied to achieve LOS C or better." A review of Exhibit 56 shows that this is not consistent with your findings. In fact, Exhibit 56 shows the following levels of service in 2013, with the build, improvements and optimized signal timing:

Western and Jenifer: B in the morning, D in the evening

Wisconsin and Jenifer: C in the morning and D in the evening

Western and Wisconsin: D in the morning and D in the evening

Western and McKinley and 41st Street: D in the morning and E in the evening

Military and 41st Street: C in the morning and C in the evening

Further, correction of the numerous errors and unrealistic assumptions would result in projected levels of service far below those presented in Exhibit 56.

Sincerely,
Marilyn Simon
5241 43rd Street, NW

-----Original Message-----

From: Frankel, David [<mailto:DFRANKEL@ftc.gov>]

Sent: Friday, October 10, 2003 9:00 AM

To: Smith, Colleen (DDOT)

Cc: Marilyn Simon; Lowrey.Bruce@hq.navy.mil; lowrey852@starpower.net;

Laurence.Freedman@usdoj.gov; AmyHoangDC3E02@aol.com; Abauer4600@aol.com;

lucy.eldridge@verizon.net; chapmantodd@yahoo.com; Smithhemb@aol.com; Kim, Ji Youn;

Ann.Simpson-Mason@dc.gov

Subject: Draft Friendship Heights Transportation Study: Additional Comments

Dear Colleen:

I have read the detailed comments on the draft Friendship Heights Transportation Study ("FHTS") that were sent to you via e-mail yesterday, October 9, 2003, by Marilyn Simon (reprinted below) and wish to make two complimentary points.

First, I agree with everything Ms. Simon has written to you.

Second, as Ms. Simon has uncovered and discussed in her point (3), the unexplained differences between the equivalent types of underlying data used respectively by DDOT and Montgomery County are dramatic and cry out for a response by DDOT. As I view the two data sets, either Montgomery County has overestimated traffic or DDOT has underestimated traffic. In other words, one of the two jurisdictions has grossly miscalculated the data. From my personal experience of living in this neighborhood for 17 years, I doubt that Montgomery County has overestimated traffic. Instead, my experience tells me that DDOT has underestimated traffic.

In their present forms, these Montgomery County versus DDOT data sets indicate that there are vastly different traffic situations on and around Wisconsin Avenue depending on whether one is on the north (Maryland) side or the south (DC) side of Western Avenue. As a long term resident of the area, I have never noticed any significant differences and simple common sense tells me there are none. If the FHTS persists in using data that is so vastly different from the Montgomery County data set, then the FHTS must explain and justify these discrepancies. In addition, I request that DDOT and its consultants run their projections and rethink their recommendations using the Montgomery County figures so readers of the FHTS can see how that would change the results, if at all.

I request that these comments be placed on the public record in addition to my previous comments.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Frankel
4336 Garrison Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016-4035

-----Original Message-----

From: Smithhemb@aol.com [mailto:Smithhemb@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, October 10, 2003 12:20 PM

To: Colleen.Smith@dc.gov; Kim, Ji Youn

Cc: chapmantodd@yahoo.com

Subject: Re: Draft Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Dear Colleen -

Here are my comments on the latest draft of the FHTS. I would like them to be incorporated into the public record.

1. The proposals contained in this draft do nothing to make the most dangerous intersection in the study area - 42nd and Military - any safer.

a. According to your statistics, 42nd and Military is the site of more injuries than any other intersection in the study area. And your number grossly understates the actual number of accidents that occur there. (The statistics themselves provide circumstantial evidence of their own inaccuracy - notice how number of incidents and number of injuries are exactly the same. Typically, accidents exceed injuries, as they do in every other intersection you've looked at.)

I've lived a half block north of this intersection for seven years now, and I doubt that a month has elapsed without me witnessing, hearing, or seeing the aftermath of a collision there. Typically, there's an accident about every other week. There have certainly been two in the past four weeks. Yesterday's involved an injury, put a pedestrian at risk, and tied up traffic on Military Road for at least an hour.

b. The problem is that cars traveling north on 42nd during evening rush hour get hit by westbound drivers on Military. Granted, driving north on 42nd through that intersection is illegal. But the signage is confusing and the law isn't enforced. (The police themselves break it.) The collisions occur because queuing (and blocking the box) in the eastbound lane of Military obscures northbound drivers' views of westbound drivers and vice versa. The fact that eastbound traffic is at a standstill while westbound traffic is whizzing by probably also contributes to the problem.

c. The intersection is also dangerous to pedestrians. During PM rush period (the queuing starts as early as 3:30 pm some days and last as late as 7 pm), there is a steady stream of foot traffic along this stretch of Military. The car collisions themselves pose a risk to people on the sidewalk as well as in the crosswalk. Cars have jumped curbs and even knocked the top off a section of the retaining wall of one neighbor's front yard in the course of these accidents. Also, northbound pedestrians, who are crossing Military legally, confront the same visibility issues that northbound cars do.

d. Eliminating queuing may or may not decrease the number of automobile collisions at this intersection. It certainly won't solve the pedestrian safety issue. Continuously flowing traffic will make this intersection more difficult to cross on foot.

e. If the intersection cannot be signalized, some combination of new signage on 42nd south of Military (and maybe on both sides of Military - with eastbound drivers being told not to block the box and westbound drivers instructed to slow down and watch for people crossing), rigorous enforcement (during PM rush/hours when there is queuing) of laws forbidding northbound travel on 42nd and blocking the box, and perhaps a mirror to increase pedestrian's ability to see westbound traffic is probably necessary.

2. In general, the draft does a poor job of identifying and addressing pedestrian safety issues. As I pointed out in my comments on the last draft (and as others informed you in the public meetings last summer), there are a number of intersections in the study area that place pedestrians at risk. These include not only 42nd & Military, but also Western & Wisconsin Circle, Western/41st/McKinley (where an island might help), and Wisconsin Avenue & Ingomar. Poor visibility (aggravated by on-street parking) and high speeds make it difficult/dangerous to cross Reno/41st at non-signalized intersections. In some cases (e.g. Livingston St.), these conditions pose problems for cars as well as pedestrians. I don't walk as much in the part of the study area that is west of Wisconsin, so I can't identify which intersections are problematic there, but if you haven't received community responses on this issue/from that area, you need to seek them out.

Additional development and improved commuter traffic flow are both likely to aggravate the pedestrian safety issues unless pedestrian safety is treated as a high priority and addressed intelligently when decisions are made about traffic management both along existing roads and involving entrances and exits of new buildings. In particular, the already dire situation at Wisconsin Circle and Western Avenue will certainly be aggravated when the new apartment building/daycare opens at the Washington Clinic site and when the shopping center expands/adds office buildings. I suspect that an all-way stop (with diagonal crosswalks) might be necessary for that intersection. Otherwise pedestrians trying to cross Western are always at risk from cars turning both directions out of buildings on either side of the street. The vehicular traffic is never straight north-south there and the stop line for cars coming out of the shopping center is so far back (to make room for bus traffic exiting the terminal) that cars and pedestrians aren't always aware of how soon their paths will cross.

And please remember that whenever you shorten the length of a light to privilege vehicular cross traffic that you must leave enough time for pedestrians to cross safely. The relative volume of vehicular traffic cannot be the only determinant of signal length. Pedestrians inherently travel at slower speeds and need to be given enough time to get across the street, even if that means that lights have to be timed for longer than it takes to get cars through the intersection.

3. Your projections of the impact of future development are completely unreliable and should be excised from the study. Your method is profoundly unscientific - in essence, you use statistics (the ITE trip generation data) that you acknowledge don't reflect the reality you're dealing with. Then you treat their presumed irrelevance as justification for discounting them by an arbitrary and quite significant amount (always 50%). I have a Ph.D. in the social sciences and, quite honestly, I'd fail any student who submitted statistical work like this to me, pointing out to him that, in essence, what he had done was just make up numbers. The utter fictionality of the data is compounded by the fact that, apparently, in applying the ITE stats, you didn't even bother to determine whether the buildings you were attributing existing traffic to were occupied or in use at the times you did your benchmark traffic counts. Certainly the ITE rates are meant to reflect buildings that are doing business (vs. vacated, not yet leased, closed) at the times when traffic is being estimated - not simply structures that have been built.

A little empirical observation (traffic counts at specific sites (there aren't that many), a few phone calls to determine whether/when businesses were in operation) and an analysis of the empirical data that already exists (e.g. census journey-to-work stats) would have shown you that the numbers you're coming up with fail the reality-check test. If you are going to use questionable data and then apply the discount factor of your choice, the only way to lend your model any kind of credibility is to show that it accurately predicts/reflects/corresponds to some known empirical reality. And your data simply doesn't.

To demonstrate this, I'm going to concentrate on one development project - the Washington Clinic site - because, by virtue of the fact that it has already been approved through the PUD process, we have enough information in the public record to make site-specific projections of trip generation.

First, the Washington Clinic was vacant at the time DDOT measured existing traffic and thus it generated none of the baseline traffic. (As an aside, even when the Clinic was in business, it didn't open until 10 am and thus never contributed to AM rush hour traffic.) As a result, any traffic generated from the new development should be treated as additional traffic; given DDOT's benchmark, there was no existing traffic/development to deduct.

The PUD granted for the Washington Clinic site authorizes the construction of 125 luxury condominiums and a stand-alone daycare center that will serve 44 children and employ a staff of 13 -16, depending on the time of year.

Chevy Chase Plaza Children's Center, which will operate this facility, has another campus in the neighborhood and, extrapolating their experience from that center (located one block from the Friendship Heights Metro station), they anticipate that 41 of their children will be driven to the center in a total of 38 cars. Only one quarter of their employees use Metro for their commute; the other three-quarters drive alone. The schedule is set up so that all of the children are supposed to arrive between 7:30 am and 9:00 am. The center can thus be anticipated to generate a total of approximately 84 trips (8 CCPCC employees and 38 parents driving in; 38 parents driving out) between 7:15 am and 9:15 am.

Census data from DC Tract 11, block groups 1 & 5, indicates that housing in the immediate vicinity of the Washington Clinic site generates .65 car commutes per unit. That means that another 81 cars can be expected to exit the site during AM rush, for a combined total of 165 trips on and off the Washington Clinic site each weekday morning rush period. This total should be treated as a minimum, given that it includes only residents leaving to go to work (not to school, to shop, or for any other purpose) and employees and children transported to daycare. No deliveries, service people, condo employees, etc. have been included in these calculations. Even if we divide this figure in half to yield a per hour rate for AM rush (treating the flow as if it would be evenly spread over the two hours in question - an assumption that seems doubtful), then we're still talking about at least 82 additional cars added by development at that site -- and all of them forced to turn onto or off of Western Avenue just east of Wisconsin Avenue (right where the busses are making left turns onto Western after leaving the terminal). Yet DDOT claims that the Stonebridge development will yield only 2 additional trips. How can we have any confidence in data that captures only 1/40th of the minimum increase in traffic that experience would lead us to predict?

Overall, I think there are powerful reasons for believing that the numbers you've produced are, to put it bluntly, junk. And since the relatively minimalist traffic mitigation measures you are proposing are amply justified by existing conditions, there's absolutely no reason for this study to make the claims it is making about development. You haven't done the kind of work you'd need to do to make sound projections, and most of the projects you're discussing have already been approved. Those that haven't been approved (Buick, WMATA) aren't even in the PUD stage yet. You should implement the proposed mitigation measures first and then measure their effects (rather than guess how/that they are going to work). When it's time to make development decisions, let's use both the then-existing traffic (rather than the hoped-for traffic) as a baseline and do the more rigorous inquiry necessary to determine what traffic implications these projects are likely to have based on experiences in this area.

Submitted by,

Sue Hemberger
5415 42nd St., NW
Washington, DC 20015
202-364-8423

10 October 2003

Endnotes

1. All of this information is available in CCPCC's January 6, 2003 Supplemental Submission to the DC Zoning Commission, filed in the course of the debate over the Stonebridge PUD for the Washington Clinic site (Case No. 02-17C).
2. I know this from personal experience - my daughter went to CCPCC -- but it can also be verified at <http://www.ccpcc.org/aboutus.html>.
3. Assuming that all seven FT staffers and half of the PT staffers arrive around the time the Center opens.
4. Discounting this traffic as "pass-through" makes no sense in this context (i.e. where we're looking at LOS at particular intersections under stress rather than, say, using trip generation stats to think about how a development will affect regional air quality or for VMT).
5. 1,220 households with 1,822 workers yielded 798 car trips (748 single-occupant vehicles and 50 cars carrying an additional 100 workers commuting in carpools).

It's worth remembering that the ITE trip generation data has, embedded within it, a variety of social facts. One, which you've recognized/discounted for, is the availability of public transportation, which is significantly greater in our area than in many of the areas whose empirical studies serves as the basis for the ITE numbers. Other relevant social facts that would argue for higher (rather than lower) trip generation rates in this area compared to the ITE norm/composite are that the high-rise residential units you're making projections for are luxury condos in an expensive urban area with a high proportion of 2-career households. In many of the suburban communities that have provided ITE data, high-rises are a cheap way to live - it doesn't take two employed individuals to afford one, as it usually will at the Washington Clinic site.

Hypothetically, the fact that ½ the workers who live in high-rises here commute via public transit (and none do in the ITE studies), wouldn't necessarily mean our trip generation rate will be ½ that of the ITE - if we've had twice as many workers/unit, the ITE rate and our rate would be the same. Moreover, since car ownership correlates with income, the very high income households that will occupy these high-rises are more likely to be driving than significantly less affluent households elsewhere. Basically, you've looked at/made adjustments to account for the sociological differences that lead to fewer car trips here but you've ignored the sociological differences that lead to more cars. That produces results with a strong bias toward underestimating the impact of development on the traffic infrastructure.

-----Original Message-----

From: BrittainSMcInnis@aol.com [mailto:BrittainSMcInnis@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, October 10, 2003 1:02 AM

To: chapmantodd@yahoo.com; AmyHoangDC3E02@aol.com; Abauer4600@aol.com; lucy.eldridge@verizon.net; colleen.smith@dc.gov; kpatterson@dccouncil.us

Cc: dmcinnis@akingump.com

Subject: Public Comment to draft Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Comment Concerning the Friendship Heights Transportation Study

We write to provide public comment concerning the draft Friendship Heights Transportation Study, dated August 18, 2003 (“draft Study”), and its recommended changes to existing traffic controls and patterns. We are concerned that the draft Study’s recommendations suggest misguided—and potentially highly detrimental—changes to the flow of “cut-through” traffic on residential streets. Indeed, we find some of the recommendations to be puzzling, as they appear to be contrary to the stated objectives of the draft Study—i.e., to address residential concerns about speeding, truck traffic, and the use of narrow residential streets for non-local traffic. In addition, some of the recommendations are myopic in scope, as they consider only the potential effects in the studied area rather than in the neighborhood-at-large. As we detail below, the failure to address these issues—or to provide any factual basis that justifies their omission—leaves the draft Study incomplete and, more accurately, fatally flawed. These flaws need to be addressed before any recommendations that will increase traffic on our neighborhood streets are implemented. We address the most glaring problems in the draft Study below.

I. The draft Study’s Recommendation to Impede Traffic on 41st Street

Apparently in an effort to reduce congestion and back-ups at the intersection of Military and Reno Roads (which includes a connection with 41st Street), the draft Study recommends some changes, many of which are simple and directed at the regulation of traffic at the intersection. Others suggest drastic changes to traffic flow.

Most absurdly, the draft Study proposes two “alternatives” that would block all northbound traffic on 41st Street, either by closing 41st Street at the intersection, or making 41st Street one-way south. The obvious, but yet ignored, consequence of either of these “alternatives” would be to divert all northbound traffic on 41st Street onto Jenifer, Ingomar, Huntington Streets and others. According to the draft Study’s own factual findings, approximately 1,400 vehicles per day on average travel northbound on 41st Street between Ingomar and Jenifer Streets, heading toward the Military Road intersection. *See Exhibit 16, Draft Study*. These 1,400 vehicles are going to have to go somewhere if the street is blocked.

What the drafters of the Study believe the results of this new traffic pattern will be is a mystery. We suggest a few obvious results. On our street, Jenifer, for example, there will be greatly increased traffic as people try to cut through to Reno Road and Connecticut Avenue. Jenifer is a narrow street (27 feet wide), which has cars parked on both sides at all times. It is often difficult, if not impossible, for cars to travel in opposite directions at the same time. Moreover, the line of sight for cars turning off of Jenifer onto Reno, or crossing over it towards Connecticut Avenue, is impeded because the intersection is not perpendicular. Even under the existing traffic plan, we have observed accidents. This dynamic is even more true for other streets, such as Ingomar, which already have a steady flow of cut-through traffic. Needless to say, greatly increased cut-through traffic on Jenifer and Ingomar Streets also will diminish the quiet, family-friendly atmosphere of these streets.

These “unintended consequences” are not hypothetical. During the recent power outage caused by Hurricane Isabel, 41st street was closed at Jenifer Street because the traffic signals at the Military Road intersection were not working. As a result, northbound traffic was diverted east on Jenifer Street. This diversion created long lines of cars backed up on Jenifer Street trying to turn onto Reno. It was virtually impossible for cars to travel west on the street during these backups. Speeding on the street also increased, as those drivers who had intended to head north on 41st Street were forced to detour onto Jenifer and tried to make up for lost time. Moreover, upon seeing that 41st Street was closed, many cars chose to run the stop signs at both 41st and Jenifer and Jenifer at Reno. Certainly, any proposal that permanently closed 41st Street to northbound traffic would inflict these hazards on residents on a daily basis.

II. Converting Jenifer Street into a Commuter Cut-Through

The proposal to reverse the Jenifer Street/43rd Street Diverter 90 degrees—and thereby route traffic from Military Road/43rd Street eastward on Jenifer Street, rather than onto Wisconsin Avenue—is equally absurd. This proposed “alternative” appears to be designed to increase the use of Jenifer Street by non-residential vehicles by connecting Military Road, 43rd Street, Jenifer and Reno, and even Connecticut. Southbound commuters on Military will use the 43rd to Jenifer route to avoid the light to reach Reno or 41st. Similarly, northbound commuters on Reno will use Jenifer (or Ingomar and Huntington) to avoid the light and reach Military and Western Avenue. As detailed above, neighborhood streets like Jenifer and Ingomar are simply not configured to accommodate cut-through traffic. While we are sympathetic to the residents of 42nd and 43rd Streets about cut-through traffic, both on the streets and in their alleys, a more direct solution would be restricting access to those streets during rush hours or perhaps even making 43rd Street a cul-de-sac and installing speed humps on 42nd.

III. The draft Study Relies Upon Arbitrary Boundaries

The net effect of these proposed “alternatives” will be to increase the use of residential streets by cut-through traffic to Reno Road. The draft Study does not have to address these problems, however, as the arbitrary eastern boundary of the study is 41st Street, not Reno Road. There is no explanation for why this choice was made, nor does it seem particularly logical. Any “recommendations” that will increase east-west directional traffic will not only increase the use of 41st Street but also Reno Road. A more practical, useful and accurate parameter has to include the likely effects on residential streets between 41st and Reno and perhaps even across to Connecticut.

IV. The draft Study Gives Ignores Neighborhood Quality Issues

Tall trees, quiet streets, inviting front porches and friendly neighbors characterize our Friendship Heights neighborhood. Our neighborhood is not, and does not aspire to become, a major commuter thoroughfare. Allowing commuter traffic to travel efficiently can be important, but that is why we have Wisconsin, Connecticut and the other “state” streets. We, and our neighbors, are more than willing to fight to preserve the residential quality of our neighborhood and resist those who would destroy our streets in the name of “efficient” traffic flow.

The draft Study appears to us, and to many others, to favor the interests of commuters—many of whom are not D.C. residents—over the interests of residents of Friendship Heights. To name but one example, what explanation is there for recommending that 41st Street become one-way *south*. Southbound traffic is likely to be comprised of a majority of Maryland commuters. Northbound traffic, which would be prohibited under that recommendation, is likely to be more residential, or at least consist of more drivers from the District.

More generally, there are a variety of options that the draft Study could have considered to inhibit cut-through commuter traffic. But many of those ideas are simply missing. Where is the consideration of restricting access to residential streets during commuter rush-hours? Where are the recommendations on how to inhibit illegal truck traffic? What about speeding on residential streets? These are the types of issues that residents, not traffic planners, want addressed. If the planners are not going to take on these issues, we will make sure our elected representatives will address them.

To be clear, we assign no ill motive to the drafters of this Study. But, the draft Study is clearly the product of a firm whose expertise is “efficient transportation,” not community preservation. Quality of life may be hard to measure and, therefore, hard to study. Nonetheless, quality of life needs to be

factored into the analysis and be a motivating part—if not *the* motivating part—of any final Study's recommendations.

Improving traffic flow in the Friendship Heights neighborhood is something residents care about. There are many simple, obvious and direct improvements that are recommended by the draft Study, which we would think most people would support, such as better signage and lane markings, improved timing and sensors on traffic lights, improved and increased enforcement of parking and traffic laws. But residents will not support recommendations that will diminish our quality of life, make our streets more crowded, threaten our safety and favor Maryland commuters at our expense.

October 10,2003

Dan and Brittain McInnis

-----Original Message-----

From: Anne Klacik [mailto:gaklacik@erols.com]

Sent: Friday, October 10, 2003 1:13 PM

To: colleen.smith@dc.gov

Subject: Friendship Transportation Study

Ms. Smith -

As residents of the 5300 block of 43rd St., we would like to express our strong support of immediate traffic calming measures on our block. The study states that 1500 cars a day travel this block - this alone is an issue.

In addition, we are subject to excessive speeding by motorists particularly in the morning hours (6 to 8 AM). This block serves as a major cut-through from Military road to southbound Wisconsin Ave. during the morning rush hour. There used to be a sign prohibiting left turns from Military Road onto 43rd which has somehow disappeared. Even when the sign was there it was ignored 99% of the time. At the least, the sign should be replaced and ENFORCED. In addition, we believe speed bumps and/or making 43rd one way so that it cannot be entered from the Military Road side would help alleviate the 1500 car a day situation and the speeding.

Last but not least - parking violations - particularly cars that hang over the ends of the alleys and dramatically reduce visibility. The curbs need to be repainted to prevent parking too close to the alley and again, ENFORCED.

Anne & Gary Klacik
5331 43rd St., NW

-----Original Message-----

From: Smithhemb@aol.com [mailto:Smithhemb@aol.com]

Sent: Monday, October 13, 2003 6:38 PM

To: Smithhemb@aol.com; Colleen.Smith@dc.gov; Kim, Ji Youn
Cc: chapmantodd@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Draft Friendship Heights Transportation Study

Two small corrections to my comments submitted last Friday. Both belong under point number 2.

Legation (not Livingston) is the non-signalized intersection where both pedestrians and cars attempting to cross 41st/Reno encounter visibility problems.

And Western and Livingston should be added to the list of intersections where pedestrians are put at risk. It is extremely difficult/dangerous to cross in the PM rush hours.

Sorry for the error and the omission,

Sue Hemberger
5415 42nd St., NW
Washington, DC 20015

Responses to Community Comments

Response to Public Comments

Response #1 (9/22/03)

Marilyn-

Following is the information you requested regarding the Friendship Heights Transportation Study:

1. Cut through traffic is a recognized problem. Although we were unable, due to budget constraints and time, to take traffic counts at every single block within the study area, we can look into the possibility of making this area a ~~one~~ four-way stop through the standard traffic-calming petition and study process, and if it meets the warrants of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
2. Comments are carefully read and are noted. Although we may not directly respond to each and every comment, we do take them into account during our analysis.
3. The Minnesota study¹ is a comprehensive analysis of transit-oriented development and land use, drawing on extensive modeling and research. It was included to show a thoroughly-documented situation in which the availability of transit in suburban areas greatly increases transit trip rates. It is significant that the 23% to 33% increase in transit rates cited in the Minnesota study (page 102) is achieved with commuter rail and bus transit, which typically operates less frequently and for shorter hours of service than the Washington Metro. As you note, it is significant that this occurs in more suburban settings than Friendship Heights. The Transit Cooperative Research Program Research Results Digest, cited below in response to Question 5, is likely more pertinent to the study, although both are relevant.
4. Regarding the use of Census 2000 data: As you may know, the Census data from the long form collects information about work trips from approximately one out of six households. However, that data has limited relevance for the current study, since in general, work trips represent only about 20 percent of total vehicle trips. In addition, to-date only profiles have been published- not the full transportation planning package.
5. Development Traffic/ Trip Generation

¹ Urban Design, Transportation, Environment and Urban Growth: Transit-Supportive Urban Design Impacts on Suburban Land Use and Transportation Planning; prepared by Carol J. Swenson (Design Center for American Urban Landscape, University of Minnesota) and Frederick C. Dock (Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.); Center for Transportation Studies, University of Minnesota; 2003.

The methodology recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) was followed to estimate the trips generated by the proposed developments. The methodology begins with a base trip generation rate for a particular type of facility (e.g., mid-rise apartment complex or cinema), expressed in terms of an independent variable (e.g., number of dwelling units, square feet, or number of seats). The base rates are for the most part typical of suburban development, as evidenced by the source studies for the data. Therefore, base trip generation rates are typically adjusted upward or downward, based on specific local characteristics (e.g., a rural, town, small urban, or large urban setting, and absence or presence and intensity of transit.)

Consistent with this approach, base trip generation rates for the new proposed land uses were obtained from the ITE Trip Generation Manual (6th Edition, 1997). These base trip generation rates were then multiplied by the appropriate independent variable (e.g., number of dwelling units, gross floor area or gross leasable area). This base trip number for each type of facility was then reduced by a specific percentage, depending on whether the facility was commercial or residential. The rationale and sources for the assumptions used follow.

Pass-by Trips- Commercial: 10%. Trip generation rates are obtained from observations and studies of facilities, with most observations occurring in suburban, dispersed settings. Some types of facilities invite opportunistic trips and “spur of the moment” decisions (e.g., diverting to the doughnut or coffee shop, or stopping by the department store on the way home). These types of trips do not add to the volume of traffic on the roadway, as the basic origin-destination trip already exists. This type of pass-by activity is enhanced in compact urban settings such as Friendship Heights, where several errands can easily be combined into a single stop due to the proximity of the service stores and the walkability of the community. This reduces the number of vehicle trips. ITE supports 10% as a conservative estimate for pass-by trips in general; some studies increase this factor to 20% to 30% for desirable, small-scale retail establishments.

Walking Trips- Related to mixed use development: 10%. Planned-unit and mixed-use developments typically combine retail uses on lower levels with residential or office uses on upper levels. This increases the “livability” of an area, with round-the-clock activity. It also reduces vehicle trips for residents or employees in the facility, as many trip purposes (e.g., errands, shopping, recreation, medical or dental visits, etc.) can be accommodated in one’s own building, or close enough to walk rather than drive.

Transit Trips- Related to Metro Rail service: 30% commercial, 40% residential. The most significant local factor affecting trip generation is the presence of high-quality transit service in the area. Virtually the entire study area, including the new developments proposed for the area, are within an easy five-minute walk to a Metro Rail station. With extended service hours, high frequency of service, and high marks for safety and reliability, Metrorail clearly is an attractor. Further, persons who will pay a premium to live or establish an office or other facility near a Metro will have a higher propensity than normal to use Metro for everyday business and travel. The Metropolitan Washington Council of Government (COG) performed a trip generation study in Friendship Heights, supporting a trip rate of 0.25 trips per dwelling unit and a 50 percent transit use.^{2, 3} The study noted that proximity to stations has a major impact on modal split. “If

² District Department of Transportation Memo dated October 8, 2002, from Kenneth Laden to Andrew Altman.

the worker was coming from Washington, D.C., the transit modal share was 52 percent...The study also found a number of housing projects near suburban Metrorail stations where the transit modal splits exceeded 50 percent...for work trips.”⁴ Studies in other areas also support the finding that transit availability significantly reduces vehicle trips. The assumptions used for this study may therefore be deemed conservative: rather than a 50 percent reduction in vehicle trips associated with 50 percent transit use, we have assumed a 30 percent reduction in trips associated with transit availability for commercial facilities, and a 40 percent reduction for trips associated with housing or residential facilities.

The specific reduction assumptions are summarized in Exhibit 38 (Exhibit numbers from the Draft Report, reproduced here).

Exhibit 38: Summary Assumptions

Categories	Assumption
Trip Reductions	
Transit – Housing Trips	40 %
Transit – Commercial Trips	30 %
Walking Trips	10 %
Pass-by Trips - Commercial	10 %
Trip Distribution	
As trips enter/leave developments	Varies
Once on the street network	According to trip counts

After the total number of trips generated by the proposed developments is obtained (by multiplying the trips generated by the trip reduction percentages), the trips are distributed on the street network. In order to perform this distribution, assumptions are made as to the trip patterns followed by the residents, clients and workers as they leave or enter the proposed developments. Once on the street network, it is assumed that they follow the trip patterns reflected by the traffic counts gathered at selected intersections in the study area.

The trips generated by the existing developments on the properties were also estimated and then subtracted from the trips generated by the new developments. Exhibit 39 summarizes the estimated additional trips generated by each development in and near the study area (including Montgomery County). *Exhibits 40 and 41 also show peak hour traffic volumes of the 12 intersections, where detailed analyses were conducted, with the proposed developments described above.*

³ Transit Cooperative Research Program, Research Results Digest, June 1995, Number 7, “An Evaluation of the Relationships Between Transit and Urban Form”.

⁴ Ibid, page 31.

Exhibit 39: Summary of Additional Trips Generated by Development⁵

Development	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL
Washington Clinic	-23	25	2	17	-18	-2
Buick Site	-5	19	14	18	8	26
WMATA Garage	52	186	238	216	149	365
Chevy Chase Center	202	34	236	62	206	268
Hecht's	273	95	368	107	339	536
GEICO	194	-50	144	107	234	401
TOTAL	693	309	1,002	677	918	1,594

5. You are correct – the legend box is mislabeled. This change will be made in the Final Report. Weekday should be shown as purple, Saturday should be shown as pink, Sunday should be shown as yellow.

6. Exhibit #14 should be the same as Exhibit #13 in terms of graphics. Currently, 43rd Street intersection should be listed as Intersection #10, the 41st intersection should be listed as Intersection #11, and the Reno Road Intersection should be listed at #12.

7. This is a small snapshot of the parking situation. Some days there will be more parking available and some days less. However, we are comfortable with our recommendations for parking which include:

- Stronger and more consistent enforcement
- Cooperation with stores to have them validate one to two hour shopping trips to increase utilization of surface lots and garages and decrease on-street parking by shoppers.
- Separate marked parking areas for service vehicles
- Consistent signage

8. This issue is also one of enforcement. DDOT will also work with the building management at 5225 to see if they can/will allow other deliveries in their block.

⁵ This table used in the draft report was revised in the final report based on additional information available information available to the Study Team.

Response #2 (10/2/2003)

Based on the recent emails we have received regarding the Friendship Heights Transportation Study, the District Department of Transportation along with the Louis Berger Group, Inc. has complied responses to the questions. Questions from both Mr. Frankel and Ms. Simon were in some instances similar, so we have created one document that addresses both the similar and different comments. (All errors will be corrected in the Final Report)

In addition, in order for the Louis Berger Group, Inc. and DDOT to appropriately respond to all questions and comments that are submitted by all residents, after this response, we will continue to take comments and questions thru October 10, 2003, but they will be addressed in the Final Transportation Study document rather than individually.

Copies of reference documents

Per your request, I will place the following sources of information in the Tenley-Friendship Public Library today (October 2, 2003):

- * The University of Minnesota Center for Transportation Studies Report: *Urban Design, Transportation, Environment and Urban Growth: Transit Supportive Urban Design Impacts on Suburban Land Use and Transportation Planning*
- * The Transportation Research Board/National Research Council *Research Results Digest*
- * Trip Generation tables for Proposed Developments in the Friendship Heights area
- * Data on detailed truck traffic on 43rd Street (9:00 AM – 6:30 PM)
- * Friendship Heights Transportation Study Scope of Work as approved by ANC 3E
- * Block Groups 1 and 5 within Census Tracts 10.01 and 11 information

Chase Towers

Chase Towers is an existing building. Vacancies are considered as part of the normal business activities in an area. For example if Chase Towers fills up, other buildings may have vacancies. Individual buildings are not considered in the analysis and average rates are used for trip generation to reflect vacancies. During any given time vacancy rates vary over time and are considered as part of normal business activity. The background traffic was expanded in recognition that there will be increased activity on an area wide basis. Individual buildings that do not exist are added if they are in the immediate area.

Traffic Diverter

As will be noted in the Final Report, the rotation of the 43rd Street Traffic Diverter has been taken off the table as a recommendation.

Truck Count Information

The report clearly indicates where and when traffic counts were taken. Prior to the study specific locations were identified and were limited due to financial constraints. The counts on 5300 block of 43rd Street and Garrison Street between Wisconsin Avenue and 44th Street were taken as additional information obtained due to comments received early in the study. Field data results will be included in the final report. Due to time and funding constraints additional counts will not be taken as part of this study. However additional counts may be considered in the future as part of the implementation of specific traffic calming measures for specific roads.

The report will recommend measures to consider for eliminating cut through traffic. As would be the case for any improvements, detailed counts will be taken prior to any implementation of a specific traffic calming procedure for a specific street. The information will be collected immediately prior as well as after a traffic calming measure is taken. The report is recommending traffic calming measures and improvements to consider.

Minnesota Study

Our previous response from 9/22 describes the underlying assumptions used in the future traffic condition analysis. The Minnesota study was used as a reference that our assumption of 50 percent transit mode share for the Friendship Heights study is reasonable since the Washington Metro area is more urban than the area (suburban) examined in the Minnesota study. Our assumption of 50 percent transit mode share is also verified in two of sources quoted in the previous 9/22 response. Furthermore, Census 2000 data showing the mean transportation mode used for commuting in the Friendship Heights area (block group 5 in census tract 11 and block group 1 in census tract 10.01) validate 50 percent transit mode share.

We used the industries standard ITE's Trip Generation Manual and ITE's Site Impact Procedure. Final report appendix will include a detailed calculation of the future traffic estimates for each proposed development concerned in the study. This will guide a reader with each step taken to estimate future net vehicle trips added by a proposed development. Note that 2013 future traffic analysis includes background growth of 0.7 percent per year in the study area in addition to the new development traffic estimates. As noted in the draft report, this growth rate is calculated using the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government transportation model, Round 6.2., traffic forecast from 2000 to 2010 for the northwest Washington area.

Parking Study Data

The parking study reflects what was found during the time period of the survey. Our AM parking utilization rate was collected from 7:20AM to 8:00AM. It was clear to the Study Team that as time goes by, the parking utilization rate increases, which is demonstrated in PM utilization (PM parking utilization was observed from 4:00PM to 4:30PM). As noted by Marilyn Simon in an email dated 9/22, Louis Berger, Inc. checked the parking study data table and exhibits presented in the draft report. Exhibits were modified with the color scheme percentage described in the table.

The study scope did not include a parking study for specific development projects. The parking needs for specific projects should be addressed as part of the site improvement study required by DC.

In addition to the recommendations included in the draft report, the final report will recommend that DDOT set an adequate parking requirement agreement with proposed developments and review existing PUD parking agreements to ensure compliance with their agreements.

Regulation of PUD agreements

DDOT will work with the building management at 5225 to see if they can/will allow other deliveries in their block. This recommendation will be included in the final report. However,

according to existing legislation, DDOT is not responsible for regulation of compliance. Rather this falls under the purview of the Office of Zoning.

Trip Generation

The trip generation process is not based on the number of cars owned by a housing unit. It is a rate based on the type of housing (apartment, townhouse, condominium, single family home). Therefore the car ownership has no direct affect on the trip rates in a site impact analysis. The car ownership will have an impact on the number of spaces needed for a facility. However a parking analysis is specific to a site impact study. Friendship Heights is a study to see what traffic problems exist and develop recommendations. Parking is not adequate for the area especially near the Wisconsin Avenue business community. This was stated in the Draft Report and will remain in the Final Report. Individual building projects include parking adequacy analysis as part of their plans.

Response #3:

The following is a response prepared for comments received until October 10th, 2003 for the Friendship Heights Transportation Study. This response was prepared for the final report appendices to provide additional explanation for comments not directly addressed in the Friendship Heights Transportation study final report.

Introduction

The Study Team and the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT) have received insightful comments from residents in the Friendship Heights area throughout the course of the Friendship Heights Transportation study. After the last public meeting on September 4th and the draft report being made available to the public, the Study Team prepared two public comment responses for DDOT on September 22nd and October 2nd. The deadline for the public comments was set as October 10th by DDOT, and the Study Team has prepared this third set of responses for comments received after September 29th.

As presented in past public meetings and the draft report, the Friendship Heights transportation study was developed in response to a request from the ANC 3E to investigate traffic and transportation management in the Friendship Heights area, focusing on resident concerns regarding speeding, cut-through traffic, truck traffic, and pedestrian safety. The ANC played the key role in developing the scope of the work for the Friendship Heights study. The study began in February 2003 and the methodology and study findings were presented at the March 13th, May 25th, and June 25th public meetings. The few public comments that were received during that time were fully considered into the draft report.

Methodology

The Study Team recommended and implemented a standard “best practice” industry methodology for the study, which was approved by DDOT. The Study Team conducted the Friendship Heights Transportation study in the following manner:

1. Consider and understand resident issues and concerns regarding transportation in the Friendship Heights neighborhood
2. Conduct subsequent data collection to verify issues raised
3. Analyze existing traffic conditions in the study area
4. Prepare recommended alternative strategies (short-term and long-term) to address existing traffic problems
5. Estimate future traffic conditions in the study area
6. Evaluate the impact of the improved options on future traffic conditions in the Friendship Heights area; modify the options if necessary to meet DDOT performance standards and to address resident comments

Data collected and used in the study are provided in the appendices and supplemental information has also been provided at the Tenleytown library as requested by the Friendship Heights area residents. All source references were made available at the library.

Comments

Future Condition Analysis

Many of public comments received after September 29th have been addressed in previous responses. The Friendship Heights transportation study scope focuses on transportation and traffic analysis in the study area. Many resident comments requested detailed site impact analyses. Note that the study was never intended as a referendum on development in the area, nor did the scope include detailed site analyses. The purpose was to examine neighborhood issues and seek engineering solutions to address those issues. However, general development impacts were considered in estimating future conditions using accepted industry practice.

The Study Team acknowledges the study area's vital development potential, thus improvement recommendations in the report considered the impact of future traffic generated by new developments and the area's natural growth (described in Chapter 3). Development information included in the study was identified when the Friendship Heights Study began. The information was verified with HOK, the DC Office of Planning and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC). The Study Team also met with some of the developers to obtain updated information on proposed land uses and development densities.

Trip Rate Comparison

A major element of the general impact analysis methodology employs trip rates for particular land uses developed by the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE). Under standard practice, these are reduced to factor an alternative mode of transportation other than automobile. Ms. Simon addressed a difference between the study's trip rate, which applied the ITE trip rate and accepted trip rate reduction methodology, and the trip rates used by the M-NCPPC. Trip rates are different between ITE and M-NCPPC because the purpose of the analysis is different. ITE trip rates are used in traffic impact analysis. The M-NCPPC generated its own trip rates to use in assessing the adequacy of public facilities prior to the approval of preliminary development plans. The M-NCPPC collected trip rates from many developments in Montgomery County, which were then averaged for the same land use type. These averages used by M-NCPPC mask the clear differences in trip generation that are typical of developments near a Metro station. In fact, based on a conversation with a Planning Coordinator (Transportation Planning) at M-NCPPC, the actual trip rate calculated for the GEICO site was approximately 50 percent lower than the trip rates derived from the M-NCPPC study for an "office" land use type. This confirms that the study's assumption of a 50 percent trip reduction from standard rates is fully justified for this study based on the proximity to the Metro and other factors described in the report.

Status of Development Details

Washington Clinic

It was confirmed that the Washington Clinic site was closed by March 2003, before the study began data collection. Therefore, the Washington Clinic site will be treated as a new development. Revised trip estimates and analysis are incorporated into the report.

Buick site

The Buick site changed ownership in April, 2003. However, after the ownership change, the Buick dealership continued to operate as a dealership on Wisconsin Avenue (verified by owner).

WMATA

The same methodology used for the other developments was applied.

Chevy Chase Center

The Chevy Chase Land Company assistant property manager confirmed that the Chevy Chase Center was up to 20 percent vacant when the traffic data was collected. However, most of vacant shops were specialty stores which generate fewer trips than the primary retail space, such as a grocery store (visits to specialty stores are commonly “spur of the moment”). Since many specialty stores open after 9AM, traffic data in the AM peak hours should not be affected. Slight differences for the PM peak hour traffic are well within study tolerances. Current vacancies at this site will be offset by future vacancies at other sites that were occupied during this study’s data collection.

Hecht’s and GEICO sites

Hecht’s and GEICO redevelopment plans have evolved over time. The study used the most up-to-date information available from the M-NCPPC on proposed land use and square footage, employing the same methodology and assumptions as for other developments. Site impact studies conducted in 1998 are of limited value because of significant changes in proposed square footage.

Based on a correspondence with the Planner Coordinator/Urban Designer at M-NCPPC, a specific tenant for the Hecht’s site is still undecided.

Pedestrian Safety

One of the most important aspects of the Friendship Heights Transportation study is pedestrian safety. When drivers are distracted by confusing lanes, confusing signs, poor sight distances, weaving traffic, and left- and right- turning or merging traffic, they are less apt to notice pedestrians and consider their safety needs. The Study Team has recommended improvements that simplify and in some cases slow traffic movements. Better lane-use signs will clarify permitted vehicular movements; better striping and signs will increase awareness of pedestrian crossings. Eliminating the traffic queues by improving the signal system or roadway design increases pedestrian visibility and reduces accident cases, as pedestrians are not tempted to walk between stopped cars.

The Study Team concurs that the safety problem at intersection of Military Road and 42nd Street should be addressed in the report. The proposed solution at this intersection is new signage that enforces the correct traffic movement and eliminates any signage confusion, accompanied by increased law enforcement as appropriate. The improvement recommendation for this intersection has been incorporated in the final report.

Census Data

Census 2000 data is a useful tool to conduct a “reality check” of a general social trend. Census data provide various types of information, including data such as vehicle ownership information by household and mode used for work trips. However, the census data only includes work trips which represents 20% of the daily trips and does not include information on other types such as

socio-recreation and non-home based trips. Also the census data on vehicle ownership, which is valuable information, is not use in the ITE procedure for developing trip generation rates. Therefore, these data are not extensive enough to be the basis for forecasting future transportation conditions.

Data Detail

The Friendship Heights Transportation study collected data for over varying periods of time based on the type of data. As described in the report, traffic volume/speed/vehicle classification data was collected over seven consecutive days including Saturday and Sunday. Other peak hour turning movement counts and pedestrian crossing counts were collected on a typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday). Parking data was collected on one weekday and on a typical Saturday (not a holiday or with scheduled special events) in recognition of the area's high concentration of attractive shopping opportunities. Furthermore, the Study Team continued to verify data through field observation throughout the study timeframe and additional data as needed.

Specific Questions

1. Ms. Simon's email from October 9th states that the study's results did not achieve level of service (LOS) C or better. The study concluded in Chapter 6 that signal optimization alone could not improve LOS of all studied intersections to C. However, transportation improvements discussed in the report, in tandem with signal optimization will bring all intersections to achieve LOS C or better (see Exhibit 57). See more detail discussed in Chapter 6.

2. The Study Team received few comments about consideration for placing a signal at intersection of Military Road and 42nd Street. While it may sound safer to have a signal at every intersection, too many signals can have a detrimental effect on pedestrian safety. When drivers are forced to stop frequently, they may speed up to race the light, which could cause a fatal accident. Moreover, more signals will increase delay times, especially during peak periods, which may lead to unwanted local street cut-through. Consideration for an additional signal system should be based on the signal warrants in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The warrant criteria include traffic volume, proximity to schools, accidents, and so on.

A four-way stop also needs to meet the all-way stop criteria identified in the MUTCD. If the engineering study concludes that the concerned intersection meets the criteria, the all-way stop sign may be considered for installation.

Residents can present a petition to DDOT requesting a signal system or a four-way stop at a location. DDOT will sign a notice of intent if the site meets the warrant, then a 30-day public comment period will be observed.